

THE HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTA- MENT CANON IN THE SYRIAN CHURCH

BY
JULIUS A. BEWER

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE
FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

CHICAGO
The University of Chicago Press
1900

THE HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTA- MENT CANON IN THE SYRIAN CHURCH

BY
JULIUS A. BEWER

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE
FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY



CHICAGO
The University of Chicago Press
1900



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41555028_0001

PREFACE.

The study of the relation of the various documents which form the material of the dissertation has something fascinating, when the religious impulses are seen at work. The Syrians were no great literary people, but they were aglow for Christ. The throbbing of their passionate love for the Savior, which distinguishes them later on, may be felt here already in the various attempts which they made to translate his gospel into their own language. This recompenses us in a certain sense for the scanty information which we have of the beginning of Christianity in Syria. Three translations of the gospels, made at pretty nearly the same time, evidence the strength of the Christian life at the very beginning. It is important that this religious element be not overlooked.

I count myself happy that my teacher, Professor Gottheil, has allowed me to take this subject for my dissertation, and that he has always directed my attention to matters of special interest for a theological student. It is due to this that I could combine my theological with my oriental studies. I want to thank him most heartily for his teaching and the kind interest he has always taken in my work.

I am impelled also to thank my teacher, Professor McGiffert. To him I owe my training in historical criticism; he suggested the theme to me, and in his seminar the thesis was first read. His kind interest has never been wanting.

This dissertation was finished in the spring of last year; therefore the newer publications could not be consulted. They would, however, have modified none of the results.

JULIUS A. BEWER.

BASLE, SWITZERLAND,
January, 1900.

THE HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON IN THE SYRIAN CHURCH.

INTRODUCTORY.

SINCE the publication of Theodor Zahn's monumental work, *Die Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, a flood of light has been thrown on the history of the New Testament canon in the Syrian church by the discovery of the Codex Syrus Sinaiticus, which modifies the course of the history a good deal. But though this famous codex has been carefully studied and compared with the other documents, though its place in the genealogy of the text has been the subject of controversy, nobody has as yet undertaken a reconstruction of the history of the New Testament canon in the Syrian church. It is this that I should like to attempt in this study. But before we can reconstruct the history, many points have to be considered, for there is lack of unanimity among scholars in regard to almost all the questions at issue.

Right at the outset it is best to define clearly what belongs to the subject and what not. I give, therefore, here a *statement of the questions* which will be treated. The cardinal point is: *only that which bears directly on the history of the canon will be considered*. Everything else, however valuable in itself, will be omitted. Thus it is not necessary for our purpose, *e. g.*, to compare the Syrus Sinaiticus, the Curetonianus, and Peshitta with the Palestinian Syriac, nor to compare the later revision, the Philoxenian and the Heraclian, with the Peshitta. The history of the text as such is different from the history of the canon. The problems to be considered are:

- i. As regards the gospels:
 1. What is the relation of Syrus Sinaiticus (= Ss) to Syrus Curetonianus (= Sc)?
 2. What is the relation of Ss and Sc to the Peshitta (= P)?
 3. What is the relation of Ss, Sc, and P to the Greek?
 4. What is the relation of Ss, Sc, and P to Tatian's Diatessaron (= T)?
 5. Which gospel did Aphraates (= A) use, the gospel harmony or the separate gospels, or both?
 6. Which did Ephraim (= E) use?

ii. As regards the Acts and epistles :

1. What does the Doctrina Addai say about them ?
2. Does Aphraates use all of them ?
3. Are all the epistles in the Peshitta ?
4. What is the relation of the text of the epistles in Aphraates to that of P ?
5. What that of Ephraim ?
6. Does Ephraim use all the books of the New Testament ?

iii. As regards canonicity :

1. What light does the Doctrina Addai shed on this question ?
2. Did Aphraates have a canon ?
3. If so, on what principle was it based ?

When these questions are answered, we are ready to attempt the reconstruction of the entire history.

The sources are not many. The lack of historical references makes the history all the more complicated. The sources are: (1) the Codex Syrus Sinaiticus (= Ss);¹ (2) the Codex Syrus Curetonianus (= Sc);¹ (3) the Peshitta (= P);¹ (4) the Diatessaron of Tatian (= T);² (5) the homilies of Aphraates (= A);³ (6) the works of Ephraim (= E);³ (7) references to Tatian and the Diatessaron in the church fathers; ⁴ (8) the Doctrina Addai.⁵

¹ Cf. E. NESTLE, "Die syrischen Bibelübersetzungen," in *Real-Encyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* (= RE), 3. Aufl., Vol. III, 1897.

² Cf. A. CIASCA, *Tatiani Evangeliorum harmoniae arabice* . . . edidit, Roma, 1888.—G. MOESINGER, *Evangelii concordantis expositio facta a sancto Ephraemo*, Venezia, 1896.—THEO. ZAHN, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur*. I. Theil: *Tatian's Diatessaron*, Erlangen, 1881—a famous reconstruction of the lost gospel harmony. See also ZAHN's article, "Zur Geschichte von Tatian's Diatessaron im Abendland," *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.*, 1894, No. 2.—J. HAMLYN HILL, *The Earliest Life of Christ ever Compiled from the Four Gospels, being the Diatessaron of Tatian*, Edinburgh, 1894.—J. RENDEL HARRIS, *The Diatessaron of Tatian. A Preliminary Study*, London, 1890, and "The Diatessaron," *Contemporary Review*, August, 1895, in answer to R. W. CASSELS, "The Diatessaron of Tatian," *Nineteenth Century*, April, 1895.—S. HEMPHILL, *The Diatessaron of Tatian*, London and Dublin, 1888.—Also the articles of J. M. FULLER in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* and of ADOLF HARNACK in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

³ Cf. NESTLE in RE, s. v.

⁴ See J. RENDEL HARRIS and HILL as quoted in footnote 2.

⁵ See CURETON, *Ancient Syriac Documents*, 1864.—GEO. PHILLIPS in his standard edition, 1876.—LIPSIUS, "Zur edessenischen Abgar-Sage," *Jahrb. f. protest. Theologie*, 1880, pp. 187 f., and on "Thaddæus," in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*.

PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATIONS.

I. THE GOSPELS.

As we should expect in any newly founded Christian church, the gospels were the first to be translated into Syriac. Having heard of Jesus Christ in the sermons preached by the missionaries, the Syrian Christians had surrendered themselves to him. An ardent longing to learn more of him than the sermons of these evangelists could give them must soon have taken hold of them. A translation of his works and words, as they had already been written down, must soon have been made. Whether Tatian was one of the early missionaries, or even the founder of Christianity, in Syria, we do not know. It is extremely doubtful. If he had been, it would be very strange that not even the slightest tradition concerning it has come down to us. We know that he has combined and interwoven the gospels in Syriac in his Diatessaron; we know that this gospel harmony was widely used in Syria; but we do not know that he was the first to give the Syrians Christianity and the translation of the Christian documents. Granted that a translation of the gospels was made early after the establishment of Christianity, we are at once confronted by the question: Which was the earlier work, the translation of the four separate gospels or the Diatessaron? We have, namely, on the one hand, a gospel harmony, and, on the other, the four gospels given us in the Syrus Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, and the Peshitta. That the contrast between the two was felt in Syria is seen from the title of the separate gospels, *ܐܘܢܬܐ ܕܝܗܘܐ ܕܡܬܥܪܝܬܐ*, *i. e.*, "the gospel of the separated." But this title cannot be used as an argument for the later origin of Ss and Sc than T, because we do not know whether the original translator has used it, or whether it was not added by the later scribe who wrote when the distinction between the separate gospels and the Diatessaron was marked, *viz.*, in the fourth century. There is no external evidence which can be brought to bear on this question of priority. It is true, we know from the *Doctrina Addai*, *Aphraates*, and *Ephraim* that the Diatessaron was widely used, but that does not mean that it was on that account the earliest text. The decision rests then, unfortunately enough, exclusively on internal evidence. We must examine the texts themselves, and there it is necessary to see the relation (1) of Ss to Sc, (2) of Ss and Sc to P, (3) of all three to the Greek, and (4) to T.

1. *The Relation of Ss to Sc.*

The order of the gospels is different in the two codices. Ss has the order (= P): Matt., Mark, Luke, John; Sc has: Matt., Mark, John,

Luke. I cannot help feeling that Sc's order seems to be older than that of Ss. The order varied in the Syrian church at first, which is seen also from D (Codex Bezae), which is so closely related to the Syriac New Testament. D has: Matt., John, Luke, Mark.⁶ The Old Syriac may, therefore, have had the order of Sc. But, on the whole, the order has very little voice in the decision. It will be seen in the course of this investigation that Ss has a different Greek original from Sc. It is unreasonable to suppose that the translators changed the order of the gospels. They translated in the order which they found in the Greek MS. used by them. All that can be inferred is that the Greek original of Ss had the order: Matt., Mark, Luke, John, while the Greek original of Sc had: Matt., Mark, John, Luke. It would be hazardous to affirm that a Greek MS. with the order Matt., Mark, John, Luke is older than one with the order Matt., Mark, Luke, John, if no other evidence were forthcoming.

Now, an examination of the two codices shows at once that they are related to each other. They are not altogether independent of each other, as was at once seen by Professor Bensly and F. C. Burkitt, when Mrs. Lewis showed them some photographed specimens of the Sinaitic codex.⁷ This has not been questioned since. Nestle, Wellhausen, Holzhey, etc., all agree in saying that the two codices stand in a certain relation to each other. What that relation is we shall see later on. It is usually thought, *e. g.*, by Wellhausen and Holzhey, that Sc is simply a recension of Ss; the revisor adding those parts which were omitted by Ss and correcting translations which did not correspond exactly to the Greek, his purpose being to bring this translation into a more intimate harmony with the Greek. Whether this position is tenable or not will appear as we go on. At all events, so much is certain, that the two codices stand in a close relation to each other.

Again, it is generally accepted that both Ss and Sc are translations from the Greek. Cureton showed this long ago for the gospels which are named after him, in the preface to his edition (1858). If there could have been any doubt whether this was so, it was removed by the reconstruction of the Greek text which underlay the Syriac translation by J. R. Crowfoot, 1871, and Friedrich Baethgen, 1885.

For the Sinaiticus no such reconstruction of the original Greek has been made as yet, though Adalbert Merx tells us that he began to

⁶ Cf. CARL HOLZHEY, *Der neuentdeckte Codex Syrus Sinaiticus untersucht* (München, 1896), p. 45.

⁷ *The Four Gospels in Syriac*, p. v.

translate Matthew into Greek, abandoning, however, this plan to bring out his German translation. The question whether Ss is a translation from the Greek is more important than might appear at first glance. If it can be proved that it is from a Greek original, then its relation to the Western Text is clearer; it cannot be that it is a translation from the old Latin, as I inclined to think for a time,⁸ nor can any other theory hold good.

Fortunately there are some indications which place it beyond doubt that the underlying text of Ss is Greek:

1. The version retains Greek words and writes them simply in Syriac form: John 11:18, *στάδιον*; 11:44, etc., *σουδάριον*; 11:54, *παρρησία*; 12:3, *λίτρα, νάρδος, πιστικός*; 6:13, *κόφινος*; 12:6, etc., *γλωσσόκομον*; 14:16, etc., *παράκλητος*; 18:3, etc., *σπείρα, λαμπάς*; 18:28, etc., *ἡγεμών*. Matt. 8:5, etc., *χιλίαρχος*; 8:9, *στρατιώτης*; 12:41, *κήρυγμα*. Mark 15:44, etc., *κεντυρίων*. Luke 13:34, etc., *πραιτώριον*; 23:53, *ἄρωμα*.⁹

2. There are incorrect translations in Ss which can be explained only on the assumption that a Greek MS. was used¹⁰: Matt. 10:40, *ἄλλοις* instead of the correct *ἀλλ' οἷς*; 13:48, *εἰς ἀγαθά* for *εἰς ἄγην* (or *ἀγγεία*). Luke 4:30, *κρεμάσαι* for *κρημνίσαι*; 19:4, *σῦκος μωρίας* for *συκομορέα*; 21:46, *ἐν στοαῖς* for *ἐν στολαῖς*. John 7:35, *σπέρμα* (*σπορά*) for *διασπορά*.

3. There is at least one interpretatory phrase which shows as clearly as possible that Ss used a Greek original: John 1:42, "Cephas, which is being interpreted *into Greek*, Peter."

These arguments are conclusive. It would not be difficult, however, to point out Greek constructions in the Syriac, if it were necessary. It is already plain that both codices are based on a Greek original.

But now, though Ss and Sc are closely related to each other, and though they are translations from the Greek, yet Sc is not merely a recension of Ss, or *vice versa*, nor is the Greek text underlying Ss the same as that which Sc used.

To keep the two points distinct, we will prove each one separately.

⁸ Cf. the interesting colophon in the MS. of the fifth century described by Gwiliam in *Studia Biblica*, I: "Finished is the holy gospel, the preaching of Mark the evangelist, *which he spake in Roman*, in the city of Rome."

⁹ For other examples see HOLZHEY, pp. 10, 11.

¹⁰ Cf. WELLHAUSEN, "Der syrische Evangelienpalimpsest vom Sinai," *Nachr. v. d. Kgl. Ges. d. Wis. z. Gött.*, Phil.-hist. Cl., 1895, Heft I; and especially C. HOLZHEY, pp. 10, 11.

First, then, Sc is not a mere recension of Ss. The texts have, in spite of their close alliance, so many differences that it is altogether improbable that the one is simply a recension of the other, occasioned by the desire of Sc's author to bring the Syriac text more closely into harmony with the Greek, correcting and adding the omissions of Ss and omitting the occasional small additions which Ss has allowed itself to make.

Though this theory is very attractive, and as set forth, for instance, by Holzhey, seemingly irresistible, because of its forceful logic and its historical probability, it is not warranted by the facts. If it were a mere recension, we should not find the many differences in passages where the Greek is evidently the same in both versions. There are grammatical, lexical, and material differences in such numbers—as will be shown—that it is impossible to account for them by the above theory.

- i. *Grammatical differences*: 1. Different tenses.—(a) Perfect for imperfect: Matt. 11:27; 12:25; 17:20; 18:15; 22:24. Luke 8:2, 35; 11:7, 18; 14:1, 29. John 6:26.—(b) Perfect for participle: Matt. 13:3; 15:5; 19:17, 21; 21:38; 22:23. Luke 7:44, 47; 8:4, 13, 49; 9:41, 45; 10:26; 11:28; 17:6, 12; 18:15; 22:60; 23:14, 40, 42; 24:18. John 6:36, 63; 7:26, 39, 46, 47, 48.—(c) Perfect for infinitive: Matt. 4:17; 5:17; 16:12. Luke 10:40. John 7:44.—(d) Imperfect for participle: Matt. 5:46; 10:39; 12:33; 20:13, 18, 23; 21:23. Luke 11:4, 10; 13:25; 17:21; 18:5, 7, 16, 17; 21:26. John 7:36.—(e) Imperfect for infinitive: Matt. 2:22; 3:15; 5:42; 13:9, 17, 43; 14:19; 18:4; 21:46. Luke 8:32; 9:2; 11:5; 17:31. John 7:44.—(f) Jussive for imperative: Matt. 5:43². Luke 9:5.—(g) Different formation of imperative: Ss forms the imperative of ܐܝܢ and ܐܠܝܡ mostly (not always, cf. Matt. 4:10; 6:31) with the first ܐ, Sc never. Ss = ܐܝܢ, ܐܠܝܡ; Sc = ܐܝܢ, ܐܠܝܡ. Matt. 2:19; 5:41; 11:28; 22:4. Luke 9:59; 10:3; 16:2.
2. Different conjugations.—(a) Ettafal for Ethpeel and Ethpaal:¹¹ Matt. 1:23; 2:3; 11:7; 12:20; 13:53; 23:12. Luke 11:50, 51; 18:14; 20:18. John 5:7.—(b) Ethp. for Peal: Matt. 1:21, 23; 5:13, 22; 17:20. Luke 10:34; 11:42², 46; 12:32; 21:26; 24:4. John 3:8; 6:33;

¹¹ Cf. NÖLDEKE, § 159.

14:21.—(c) Ethp. for Peal participle passive: Matt. 4:14; 18:17. Luke 10:20. John 3:27.

- ii. *Lexical differences:* 1. Verbs.—I counted more than 110 differences in verbs in the two codices, and I am sure that there are still more. These are evenly distributed over the gospels—about 86 in Matt., 32 in Luke, 22 in John.
2. Nouns.—I catalogued about 123 differences in nouns, and there are rather more than less—55 in Matt., 57 in Luke, 11 in John. There are also nouns of the same stem, but of different formation, used—4 in Matt. and 3 in Luke.
3. Adjectives.—There are naturally not so many, but enough; *e.g.*: Matt. 3:11; 13:48; 14:30, 31; 15:32; 22:38; 23:6; Luke 7:43; 11:46; 12:7; 14:20; 15:7; 17:15; 19:18; 20:30. John 3:26.
4. Adverbial expressions.—Matt. 3:16; 13:5; 14:27, 31. Luke 12:36; 17:7; 15:8; 24:25. John 5:9, etc.
5. Prepositions.—John 3:21, 24, 29, 31, 34; 4:2, 9, 18; 5:13; 6:33; 7:1. Matt. 1:22; 2:3, 12; 4:14; 8:17; 11:18; 12:17; 15:1; 17:24; 20:20. Luke 2:7; 12:16; 15:1. 22:45; etc., etc.
6. Particles.—Matt. 1:24; 2:2; 4:4; 6:1, 2, 6, 7; 13:54. Luke 12:37; 17:18, 37; 20:17; 22:70; 22:29; 23:3. John 1:28, 38, 39; 11:37; etc., etc.
- iii. *Different phrases and constructions:* Matt. 1:16, 25; 4:6, 21, 22, 24, 25; 5:2; 13:4; 14:4; 17:15; 18:3, 8; 19:22; 22:25, 28, 30. Luke 8:4, 31; 9:10; 18:15; 19:34, 39; 20:16. John 4:24; 5:19; 6:9; etc., etc. Many other passages could be cited.

In considering these grammatical, lexical, and material differences, one must not leave out of account that many chapters cannot be compared because they are wanting in the one or the other, or in both; so the entire gospel of Luke and whole chapters of the other gospels. A pretty accurate idea of how greatly the two texts differ may be got by looking through Bonus' careful collation, which fills a considerable volume, and it will be noticed that they are not only numerous, but important differences.¹²

¹² Orthographical differences have very little to do with the argument; one could place alongside of Holzhey's orthographical lists others which would prove the contrary.

If the one is simply a recension of the other, one asks in vain why there should be so many variations, which dispose one at times to think that the two texts are not at all related to each other.¹³ They cannot be explained on the ground of a different dialect, so that the author had to adjust the translation to the language which the people of that section of Syria spoke in which he lived; because the expression which the author of Sc substituted for an expression in Ss will occur also in another passage in Ss. There is no system in the variations which would lead one to suspect simple dialectical differences. It is true, some differences might be explained in that way, *e. g.*, ܡܕܝܐ, ܡܕܝܐ, but even that would be difficult, because the one verb is not confined to either text—the substitution is not consistently carried out. However that may be in single cases, a theory of dialectical differences does not do justice to the differences as a whole, though it may explain a few. Nor is it plausible that the author of Sc should have exchanged just as he pleased verbs and nouns and phrases and constructions. That would be a rather too capricious and unscrupulous procedure.

Another point, though not of so great importance, is the fact that Sc introduces again Greek words into the text which Ss has already rendered by good Syriac terms; *e. g.*:¹⁴ Matt. 5:18, *μόδιος*; 14:1, *τέτραρχος*; 14:36, *στολή*; 18:7, *ἀνάγκη*; 18:10, *πρόσωπον*; Luke 23:25, *αἵρέσεις*. If one looks at this fact without prejudice, it is at least strange that Sc, if it be a mere recension of Ss, should have given up good translations which it found already in Ss, and should have translated them by simple transcription of the respective Greek words. The explanation suggested,¹⁴ that this is due to Sc's endeavor to conform his text more closely to the Greek, even at cost of good Syriac, is, to say the least, artificial.

Again, the many omissions, as they are called, of Ss and his slight additions might be used as an argument for the proposition that Sc is not merely a recension of Ss. They might be explained in this way: Ss, not intending to give a literal and precise translation, endeavored only to make a good, popular one; in doing so he omitted phrases, clauses, and sometimes whole verses; in one case an entire section. They were not important for him, gave no new light, and could therefore well be omitted. The result would be only a more forcible and popular translation. In the same way he thought it of

¹³ Cf. NESTLE, *Theol. Lit.-Zeitung*, l. c.

¹⁴ HOLZHEY, p. 11.

little importance to add a word or phrase now and then, if only the text thereby became more readable and plainer.

Now, when Sc came to revise this text of Ss, he faithfully added those parts which had been omitted by Ss, and struck out those additions which Ss had permitted himself to make. The result of this revision would be a text which was more like the Greek, though perhaps not yet an altogether literal translation, since even Sc's desire was to present a good popular piece of work rather than a slavish imitation of the Greek.

Were the additions of Sc, filling out those places which Ss omitted, and the omissions of the arbitrary additions of Ss the only things which are different in the two texts, then, of course, this explanation would be correct. But as the case lies, the other differences, grammatical, lexical, and material, are too many; they alone are sufficient to show that Sc is not merely a recension of Ss. If this is taken into account, the argument from the additions and omissions gains its full weight, and confirms the thesis that Sc is not a mere recension of Ss.

Many of the material differences find their explanation in the fact that Ss presupposes a different Greek original from Sc's Greek text.

The proof for this lies not so much in the use of different phrases, as, *e. g.*, in such passages as Matt. 5 : 2, where Ss = ἤρχετο λέγειν αὐτοῖς ; Sc = καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς λέγων ; but rather in the omissions and additions of Ss.

First of all it should be noted, in regard to the omissions of Ss, that they are not the work of the arbitrary translator, who has been accused of omitting and adding as he saw fit, if it only made his translation better, more forceful and popular. Now, this is unwarranted by the facts. Ss is more faithful to his text than he has been supposed to be. There are many cases, and those are the most important, where we can put our finger on the same omissions and additions in other MSS. This makes it highly probable, if not certain, that the Greek MS. of Ss did not have the passages omitted in the translation, and had those which we call additions.

Of course, he would omit passages which are merely explanatory phrases in Greek for words which needed no interpretation for a Syrian. But even in regard to these one may doubt whether they were in the original Greek or not ; *e. g.* :

Matt. 4 : 18, τὸν λεγόμενον Πέτρον ; 27 : 33, ὃ ἐστὶν Κρανίου Τόπος λεγόμενος ; 27 : 46, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν Θεέ μου, θεέ μου, ἵνα τί με ἐγκατέλιπες. Mark 3 : 17,

ὁ ἐστὶν Υἱὸς βροντῆς; 7:34, ὁ ἐστὶν Διανοίχθητι; 15:34, ὁ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνεόμενον Ὁ θεός μου [ὁ θεός μου] εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπες με. John 1:38, ὁ λέγεται μεθερμηνεόμενον Διδάσκαλε; 1:41, ὁ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνεόμενον Χριστός; 4:25, ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός; 9:7, ὁ ἐρμηνεύεται Ἀπεσταλμένος; 11:16; 20:24; 21:2, ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος; 20:16, ὁ λέγεται Διδάσκαλε.

In any case, omissions like these are natural; we expect them. Two such interpretations of Hebrew and Aramæan terms, which were necessary in Greek, but superfluous in Syriac, have remained in the text; viz.: Matt. 1:23 "Immanuel, which is interpreted, God with us;" and John 1:42, "Cephas, which is being interpreted into Greek, Peter." Whether these two passages have been left merely by accident, or whether they go to prove that Ss was so faithful to his original that he would add even such matters as were unimportant or superfluous in a Syriac translation, if they were in the original Greek text, is impossible to decide dogmatically. But it is certain that, even if he omitted those passages because he saw that they were superfluous, the omissions are entirely natural, and do by no means reflect on the faithfulness of his translation. He is, indeed, a very faithful translator; he does not omit passages which seem to him unimportant, nor does he add when he likes. We shall see that the most important omissions as well as additions are paralleled in other MSS., especially in those of the western group. In the list which is given below I have taken only the most important omissions and additions, and noted down when the omission was paralleled by one or more MSS., when Westcott and Hort (=W-H) or Tischendorf (=Tisch.) bracketed it or put it on the margin. I have simply noted this, because that implies that there is a good deal of doubt whether the verse or phrase belongs in the text or not. As the basis for the comparison I have used Westcott and Hort's text. Thus, when W-H omit passages which Ss omits also, no notice has been taken of them. This reduces the number of the otherwise very numerous omissions.

Ss omits Matt. 1:25 (partly), K also; 4:24 partly;¹⁵ 5:30, D also; 5:47, K also; 6:5; 9:34, D a K also, W-H bracket; 10:13, ἡ δξία, D also; 10:19, πως η, a K, etc., also; 12:47, W-H margin, Tisch. bracket; 16:2, 3,

¹⁵ Cf. BLASS, *Evgl. Luc.*, praefatio, p. lxxvi: Apud Matt. 4:24 absunt ab Syro Lew. verba καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν Συρίαν, tum ibidem καὶ δαιμονιζομένους καὶ σεληνιαζομένους (καὶ σελ. et. K om.) καὶ παραλυτικούς; paulloque post (25) pro καὶ ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοὶ κτέ habet idem "et facta magna multitudo": in quibus omnibus nisi Tatiani licentiam sive alius Syri interpretis mecum agnoscere velis, non invenies explicationem differentiae. Nullane ergo huic testi fides habenda?

W-H bracket; 21:44, W-H bracket, Tisch. om.; 22:4, το αριστον μου ητοιμασα, οι ταυροι μου και τα σιτιστα τεθυμενα; Sc om. only: και τα σιτιστα τεθυμενα.—Mark 7:8, αφεντες γαρ την εντολην του Θεου, κρατειτε την παραδοσιν των ανθρωπων; 9:3, οια γναφεις επι της γης ου δυναται ουντως λευκαναι, X a n om. also; 9:49, πασα γαρ θυσια αλι αλισθησεται, W-H put it on the margin, Tisch. om.; 10:2, προσελθοντες Φαρισαιοι, D a b K om., bracketed by W-H; 10:42, ο δε Ιησους—δοκουντες—και οι μεγαλοι αυτων κατεξουσιαζουσιν αυτων; 11:8, αλλοι δε στιβαδας κοψαντες εκ των αγρων; 12:4, entire verse; 13:9, Βλεπετε δε υμεις εαυτους—om. also by **N***—και εις συναγωγας δαρησεσθε; 14:65, και περικαλυπτει το προσωπον αυτου, D a f om.; 14:42, και ηδη οφιας γενομενης επει ην παρασκευη, ο εστι προ . . . ; 16:8, απο του μνημειου. ειχε δε αυτας τρομος και εκστασις; 16:9–20, om. **N**, B.—Luke 6:40, κατηρτισμενος δε πας εσται ως ο διδασκαλος αυτου, ΓΛ* 48^{ov} om.; 7:7, διο ουδε εμαντον ηξιωσα προς σε ελθειν, D 63, 240, 244, a b c e ff²* om.; 8:43, ητις εις ιατρος προσαναλωσασα ολον τον βιον; D: ην ουδε εις ισχυεν θεραπευσαι—om. the rest; Ss: ουκ ισχυσεν απ' ουδενος θεραπευθηναι; 9:54, ως και Ηλειας εποιησεν, W-H margin, Tisch. om.; 9:55, 56, και ειπεν, ουκ οιδατε ποιου πνευματος εστε το σωσαι, W-H on margin, Tisch. om.; 10:41, 42, μεριμνης και θορυβαζη περι πολλα, ολιγων δε εστιν χρεια η ενος, W-H Γ¹, a b e ff² om., D also except θορυβαζη; 11:11, αρτον, μη λιθον επι δωσει αυτω, W-H margin; 11:36, ολον—μη εχον τι μερος—εσται φωτεινον ολον, D a b e ff², Sc om. also;¹⁶ 11:53, και αποστοματιζειν αυτον περιπλειωνων, W-H margin; 11:54, ενεδρευοντες αυτον θηρευσαι τι εκ στοματος αυτου, W-H Γ¹; D: αφορμην τινα λαβειν αυτου, om. ενεδρευοντες; Sc. also; 12:9, om. e; 12:39, εγρηγορησεν αν, W-H Γ¹ margin simply: ουκ αν, so Tisch. in text; 14:27, om. M*R F al. mu.; 16:7, και λεγει αυτω Δεξαι σου το γραμμα; 16:18, απο ανδρος, D om.; 19:25, D 69, etc., Sc om.; 19:33, ειπον οι κυριοι αυτου προς αυτους τι λυετε τον πωλον, Sc also; 20:36, και νιοι εισιν του θεου, W-H Γ¹, some MSS. om. και νιοι εισιν; 21:10, τοτε ελεγεν αυτοις, D e l a ff² Sc om.; 22:43, 44, bracketed twice by W-H; 23:10–12; 23:34a, W-H bracket twice; 23:51, ουτος ουκ ην συγκατατεθειμενος τη βουλη και τη πραξει αυτων; 24:42, και απο μελισσιου κηριον, W-H margin, Tisch. om.; 24:52, εις τον ουρανον—προσκυνησαντες αυτον, W-H bracket, Tisch. om.—John 1:38, θεασαμενος αυτους ακολουθουντας; 4:9, ουσης γυναικος Σαμαρειτιδος; 12:8, D om.; 13:32, εν ο θεος εδοξασθη εν αυτω, omission well attested; 13:34, ινα και υμεις αγαπατε αλληλους, X Γ al¹⁰,

¹⁶q: Si ergo corpus tuum lucernam non habens lucidam obscurum est, quanto magis cum lucerna luceat, inluminat te.

f: Si enim corpus quod in te est lucernam non habuerit lucentem tibi tenebrosa est, quanto magis autem lucerna tua fulgens lucebit tibi.

c e ff² om.; 14:10, τα ρηματα το αυτος ποιει τα εργα; 14:11; 14:14, ΧΛ 1. 22 2^{pe} 6^{pe} al⁵ b fu Syr^{hr} Arm^{zoh} et^{add} om.; 16:3; 17:11, φ δεδωκας το ημεις, Hil^{4272, 2062} om.; 20:7; 21:15, a b c e ff² om. πλεον τουτων, a e om. συ οιδας οτι φιλω σε; 21:16, a om. συ οιδας οτι φιλω σε; 21:25, οσα—ουδε αυτον οιμαι—τα γραφομενα βιβλια, Tisch. om. entire verse, a b e ff² et alia autem [b quidem a om.] multa fecit Jesus = Ss, L n ti ατινα εαν γραφηται καθ' εν.

The result of this comparison cannot be doubtful. It places the translator of Ss in the right light; he is very faithful to his original. Though there are some omissions which cannot be duplicated in other MSS., yet most of them can. This leads us to think that these other omissions also were not his own; he found them already in his Greek text.

The same will be seen in his additions, which are said to be due to Ss' idiosyncrasies. They also can be duplicated—most of them at least. It will be remembered that the additions are small, and not of so great importance as the omissions. The limited number given in the footnote below¹⁷ will therefore suffice to show that they also are not made by him in order to make his text clearer, but they are there because they were in his original Greek.

Having shown that Ss is faithful to his original, and that he reproduces his Greek text accurately, we are ready to see that the original of Ss must have been different from that of Sc. Sc uses a much fuller Greek text than Ss. Here are some verses which are not in Ss, but are in Sc: Matt. 1:8b; 4:24b; 5:25, 30, 47; 6:5; 8:5 (partly); 23:14; Mark 16:9-20; Luke 8:43; 9:55, 56; 12:38b; 22:43, 44; 23:12-14, 34; John 5:12; 14:10, 11. There are few additions which Ss has and which are not in Sc: Luke 11:36; 14:13; 19:32; 23:20;

¹⁷ Matt. 10:23, "and if they persecute you in the other city, flee ye to another." W-H place it in the margin, which shows that there are at least some texts which have it. 27:16, "Jesus" is added to Barabbas. This we find also in the Palestinian Syriac, which shows that it was not an addition of Ss, but that there were Greek texts which had this addition.—John 3:8, Ss adds πνευμα δε ο θεος; cf. Tischendorf's note, which shows that Ss does not stand alone in doing this.—Luke 23:37, Ss (+ Sc) adds χαιρε . . . και επεθηκαν επι την κεφαλην αυτου στεφανον ακανθινον.—D c χαιρε . . . περιτεθεντες (d imponentes c imposuerunt autem) αυτω και ακανθινον στεφανον.—John 20:16, Ss adds: και προσεδραμεν αψασθαι αυτου. N^{ca} 13. 346. g. gat. mm Syr^p et^{hr} Cyr^{4, 1083} also. 12:3, Ss has with D d, etc. . . . effudit super caput ihesu recumbentis.—Luke 23:48, Ss, "Saying 'woe unto us, what hath befallen us! Woe unto us for our sins.'" Sc has this also. So has the gospel of Peter. Very similar is g1: "Vae nobis, quae facta sunt hodie propter peccata nostra, appropinquavit enim desolatio Hierosolem."—Matt. 27:28, Ss adds, πορφυρου; so also D 157 a b c f ff², etc.

John 6:13; none of them are, moreover, entire verses, but only parts of verses.

Another argument for the difference of texts lies in translations in which Ss is paralleled by other texts, and Sc also, but different from those representing Ss:

E. g., Matt. 3:16, where Ss = ܡܕܝܐ ܕܡܝܐ = *en eidei peristērās*; Sc = ܡܕܝܐ ܕܡܝܐ = *ōsēi peristērān* = W-H, Tisch. The text of Ss is represented by Ev. Ebion.: *καὶ ὡς ἀνῆλθεν ἀπο τοῦ ὕδατος, ἠνοιγῆσαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ εἶδε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν ἁγίον ἐν εἰδεί περισσεύας καθελθούσης καὶ εἰσελθούσης εἰς αὐτόν*; cf. Ephraim, Diatessaron, too. 5:2, Ss: *ἤρχετο λέγειν αὐτοῖς*; Sc: *καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα οὗτοῦ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς λέγων*, the regular text. 27:16, 17, Ss: *Ἰησοῦν Βαραββᾶν*—witnesses see in Tischendorf; Sc: *Βαραββᾶν*, regular text.—Luke 2:48, Ss: *ὁ πατήρ σου καγώ*, on the difference in the tradition cf. Tisch.; Sc: *ἡμεῖς*. 11:36, Ss has the verse, Sc omits it with D a b c ff² i. 11:13, Ss: *δόματα ἀγαθὰ*, for witnesses for this reading cf. Tisch.; Sc: *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, the accepted reading. 11:38, Ss: *ἐθαύμασεν*, so Tisch., W-H; Sc: *ἤρξατο διακρινόμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ λέγειν*; there are a number of witnesses for this reading.—Matt. 21:31, Ss: *ὁ ὕστερος*, D and others; Sc: *ὁ πρῶτος*, Tischendorf's text. 3:4, Ss: *ἄγρος ܡܕܝܐ*, so also the Palest. Syriac and the Diat.; Sc: *ἄγριος ܡܕܝܐ*, all others.—Luke 19:32, Ss has *οἱ ἄπεισταλμένοι καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς*, with W-H, Textus Receptus, Tischendorf; Sc omits it; so e (DG).—Matt. 5:45, the different position of the verses: Ss has the regular order, Sc vss. 5, 4, paralleled by other texts.

Such examples show very clearly that the two Greek texts underlying Ss and Sc respectively were different from each other. Sc's text is much fuller than Ss'. Both texts are very old, dating certainly from the second century; but Ss' is older than that of Sc; compare for this the first chapter of Matthew relating the birth of Jesus, and the omissions as well as the sometimes curious additions. Add to this priority of Ss' Greek original the affinity which exists between the Sinaiticus and the Palestinian Syriac, and the fact that Sc's divisions in the text are finer than those of Ss,¹⁸ and it follows that Ss is older than Sc.

We have now reached the conclusion that, though Ss is closely related to Sc, though both are translations from the Greek, Sc is no mere recension of Ss; that the Greek text underlying them is not the same, Ss' being older; that Ss is older than Sc. Now we must answer the question: What is, then, the relation of Ss to Sc, if one is not a recension of the other?

¹⁸ Cf. MERX in his German translation.

Two answers are possible, which do not exclude each other : either the translators of Ss and Sc belonged to the same school, or they used the same Syriac text (Syr. vetus) as the basis of their own translation.

When two men who have had the same education are called upon to translate a given piece from one language into another, the ground stock of the work will be the same, but in details the two translations will differ. Each will naturally use the terms which lie most readily at his hand. Sometimes they will have exactly the same translation ; sometimes the words which we mostly find in the one will be in the other, and *vice versa*. Lexical differences are inevitable. Grammatical differences are also to be expected ; it would be strange if they were not found. Differences in the constructions are bound to arise, because no two men use the same constructions, though they may have always been in the same school. All this is what we find in these two texts, Ss and Sc. The ground stock of the two, leaving out of account the so-called omissions and additions, is essentially the same, but the vocabulary and the grammar of the two are different. They belong to the same school ; their task was the same, viz., to translate a given text from Greek into Syriac ; their ability was about the same ; but their works are in a way independent of each other. The relation which exists between the two proves that they belonged to the same school, not that one is dependent on the other.

This is the most satisfactory way of explaining the relationship of the two, which agree in so many parts and differ so decidedly in so many others.

The other answer, that both Ss and Sc used the same Syriac text as a basis of their work, might also explain the matter, though one would still be at a loss how to explain the many differences. The groundwork of Ss and Sc would be that of the Old Syriac, which has not yet been discovered. Both Ss and Sc would have changed that text as to vocabulary and grammar pretty much as they pleased. They would still be independent of each other in the way that neither of them made use of the other, both simply taking the same text as a foundation. The whole process, however, does not commend itself as so simple in its solution of the difficulties.¹⁹

This brings up the question about the Old Syriac, that text which is supposed to lie back of all the texts we have. To speak dogmatically

¹⁹ The examples given by Wellhausen and Nestle, which point in the direction that some expressions in Sc are older than the corresponding expressions in Ss, give some foundation to this theory.

on this subject is hazardous; the data are too few. The opinion to which I have come is as follows: It cannot be proved as yet, and must be taken for what it is worth. The very first gospel translator in Syria did not translate all four gospels, but one. Which one of the four we cannot tell; perhaps Mark, perhaps John. This would meet at first all the requirements. But soon somebody else, or perhaps the same man who translated the first gospel, would take another gospel and translate that also. The two would come together. The same process would be repeated till all four gospels were translated. The different order in Ss and Sc—Ss=Matthew, Mark, Luke, John; Sc=Matthew, Mark, John, Luke—points in this direction. At first the gospels existed side by side; then they would be bound together; the order would vary in the different copies. Gradually, through outside influence, the position of Matthew and Mark would become fixed (or does the position perhaps indicate that they were first translated?). As to Luke and John there was still some fluctuation, till the now accepted order: Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, became established.

This suggestion will appear still more plausible when we come to look at it in the light of the history of the foundation of the Syrian church.

2. *The Relation of Ss and Sc to P.*

It has long been recognized that the Peshitta was not the original Old Syriac text. Already in the last century men pointed out that this text must be the result of a development, the last of a series of which the other parts were at that time still wanting. But since the discovery of Sc in 1842 (1858) and of Ss in 1892 the proofs of this assertion have become manifest.

I do not think, however, that it can be asserted justly that P is a recension of Ss and Sc. There is no doubt that all of them are related to each other, but that does not mean that P is a recension of the others. A comparison of the three texts shows that in many passages $P=Ss=Sc$; that they have a good deal in common. But there are also many passages where P agrees with the one and differs from the other; in others it differs from both, whether they be alike or different from each other.²⁰ That means that P is, indeed, related to Ss and Sc, but is at the same time relatively independent of them; the process which was described in connection with Ss and Sc is evidently repeated here. As there, so here, the translator worked independently, but was influenced now by Ss, now by Sc. The fact

²⁰ Cf. ALB. BONUS, *Collatio*, etc.

that P combines the readings of Ss and Sc helps us to determine P's age, not absolutely, but relatively. Can it be said that P is the oldest text, on which Ss and Sc base their translations? That would explain why P agrees now with Ss, now with Sc. But it would not explain the great differences of the three texts. These differences can be accounted for only on the assumption of different Greek originals. And as regards these Greek originals, it is at once clear that P does not present nearly as old a text as either Ss or Sc, a fact which is so apparent to the reader of the three that it needs no further proof. Texts like Ss and Sc presuppose a very old Greek original, which cannot be claimed for P. We have, then, a text combining the readings of two other texts, but using a later original than the two others. The conclusion is inevitable: P is later than Ss and Sc, by which it is influenced. The motive which lay at the basis of these three different texts is to be sought in the desire of the Syrians to conform their text to that which was accepted by the Græco-Roman church.²¹ That desire necessitated the translation of P especially, but P is only one of the texts which originated under these circumstances. We shall find others suggested by Aphraates and Ephraim.

At this point it is well to sum up the results which we have reached thus far :

1. There is a certain kind of relationship between Ss and Sc ; they are not absolutely independent of each other.
2. Both Ss and Sc are translations from the Greek.
3. Sc is not a mere recension of Ss, nor *vice versa*.
4. Ss presupposes a Greek original different from that of Sc.
5. Ss' original Greek was shorter and older than Sc's.
6. Ss is older than Sc.
7. The close resemblance of Ss and Sc in many parts and the difference in others is explained by the fact that the translators either belonged to the same school or used the same Syriac text (the Old Syriac) as the basis of their own translations. The first is the more probable explanation.
8. The relation of P to Ss and Sc is similar to that of Ss to Sc. P is no recension of either, but is influenced by both, which is seen in the fact that it combines the readings of both.
9. The original Greek of P is younger than that of either Ss or Sc.
10. P is younger than Ss and Sc, the genealogy being : Ss, Sc, P.

²¹ See also ZAHN and HOLZHEY.

3. *The Relation of Ss, Sc, and P to the Diatessaron.*²²

It is a great misfortune that we do not possess the original of Tatian's Diatessaron. As was already noticed, the determination of the priority of the gospel harmony or of the separate gospels has to rest wholly on internal evidence. And this is very precarious and very difficult, because the text of Tatian's work has by no means been fixed yet. Though there are for the reconstruction of it the commentary of Ephraim on the Diatessaron, the citations of Aphraates, the Arabic Diatessaron, the Latin harmony of Victor of Capua, and the references in the Syrian church fathers, yet these witnesses are not all too reliable, and their testimony may be challenged.²³

In addition to this uncertainty about the text comes the fact that we do not know how faithfully Tatian handled his sources. His purpose was practical—he wanted to make a gospel harmony; but we know from several sources that he omitted certain portions which did not please him, and others he altered as he wanted.

We must keep these facts in mind in making our examination. And it may be said that, in view of all this, an *absolutely* certain result is not to be expected. It must necessarily be largely a balancing of arguments, which to some minds will preponderate in this, to others in that direction.

²² Cf. F. C. BURKITT, in *The Guardian*, October 31, 1894.

²³ Ephraim's fragments are of the greatest value, but one has to remember that they are not accessible in the original, and also that he uses the Peshitto, too, which is, indeed, his ordinary Bible. He must often have mixed the two together, and in some passages have given the Peshitta reading, which was not at all in the Diatessaron.

Aphraates is the only one who preserves the citations in Syriac, excepting the later church fathers, who quote from Ephraim, and yet even he must be looked upon with suspicion, because he also, as we shall see, knew and used another version of the gospels, different from the Diatessaron, side by side with the harmony.

The Arabic Diatessaron must have undergone considerable changes, not only owing to the translations from one language into the other. Peculiar readings will have been erased by orthodox men, so as to make the work more conformed to the orthodox New Testament. It is, perhaps, mainly useful for the arrangement of the original work, for, as is evident from Aphraates, many portions which were harmonized by the original work are given here only in the translation of one of the parallel passages; the finely interwoven network of Tatian has disappeared from them.

The Latin harmony of Victor of Capua is based on the Vulgate, and so cannot be of very much use, though, of course, for the arrangement, and perhaps also now and then for a text which the scribe might not always have found in the Vulgate, and therefore translated directly from the Syriac, it might be of some use.

One thing, however, is clear and absolutely certain, namely, that the two sets of texts, the separate and the interwoven gospels, are related to each other, are dependent one on the other, the only question being which is the earlier.²⁴

Such agreements as these are the best evidence for the fact that the gospel harmony of Tatian and the separate gospels stand in an intimate relationship. The problem before us now is: What is their relative age, which is prior, T or the separate gospels?

We are at once confronted with the question: How could the Diatessaron have had such a prominence in the early Syrian church; how could it have been used so widely, if it was not the first gospel which the Syrians had? This argument in favor of Tatian's gospel harmony is of very little weight. It seems, of course, at first sight, to stand absolutely in the way of the priority of the separate gospels. For how could it be, it is asked, that the Syrians should have possessed and used first the separate gospels and then, when the Diatessaron came, laid those original gospels aside and used only the Diatessaron? First of all, it is a pure assumption, which cannot be verified, that they suspended the use of the separate gospels entirely. Secondly, it must not be overlooked that a harmony has many practical advantages over the separate gospels, especially for liturgical purposes. Thirdly, it must not be forgotten that the harmony was made just about the time when Christianity became the national religion of Syria. The

²⁴ Evidences of this relationship are seen in such passages as Matt. 3:4, where Ss and T read, instead of *μελι αγριον*, *μελι αγρου* ܡܠܝܐ ܐܓܪܘܢ, while Sc, P, and most of the Greek texts read *μελι αγριον*. A reading like this points to some kind of an affinity between the two texts.—3:10 (= Luke 3:9), "Ἦδη δὲ ἡ ἄξινη πρὸς τὴν ῥίζαν τῶν δένδρων κείται" is translated by T and all the separate gospels, Ss, Sc, P, as if there stood *ἴδε*, contrary to all other witnesses to the text.—3:16, Ss and T read *ἐν εἰδει περιστερᾶς*, which only few minor witnesses have, while the great bulk of the Greek MSS., together with Sc and P, read *ὥσει (ὡς) περιστερᾶν*.—13:48, Ss, Sc, T translate the words *συνέλεξαν τὰ καλὰ εἰς ἀγγελίαν* (or *ἀγγελία*) as if they had read *συνέλεξαν τὰ καλὰ εἰς ἀγαθὰ*.—Mark 6:8, Ss translates in *ἵνα μηδὲν αἰρώσι εἰς ὁδὸν εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον μόνον*, the *ῥάβδον* with *shavtā*, evidently to bring this statement into harmony with Matt. 10:10 and Luke 9:3, where the *ῥάβδον* is not allowed. P. has *shavtā* in all three passages, Sc has it in Luke 9:3, Matt. 10:10 being missing. Now, Tatian's Diatessaron has: "Possess . . . a staff . . . [but] no stick," which is precisely what we find in Ss. Ss has, namely, in Matt. 10:10, Luke 9:3, a different word from that used in Mark 6:8, viz., *khuṭrā* ("bludgeon").—John 4:25, Ss and T translate the regular text *οἶδα ὅτι Μεσσίας ἔρχεται, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν ἅπαντα* with *ἴδε Μεσσίας ἔρχεται, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος δώσει (ἡμῖν omitted by Ss) ἅπαντα*, a reading which is unparalleled by any other text. See ZAHN, *Theol. Literatur-Blatt*, 1895, No. 25; BURKITT, *l. c.*, for these examples.

question may be asked, with just as much weight, whether it would be possible, or probable, that the Syrian Christians should have done so long without the gospels that they received the first translation not before about 172 A. D. Again, would it be likely that the translator of the four separate gospels should have used the Diatessaron as the basis of his translation, should have untwisted the finely coupled, sometimes masterly mixed, substance, and then should have gone on with his translation? Does it not seem much more natural that the compiler of the harmony used a Syriac translation of the separate gospels, which would save him the work of translating before he began to harmonize? This supposition does not rest on common-sense only; positive proof can be adduced for it.

Incidentally it should be said here that there is now practically unanimity in regard to the fact that the Diatessaron of Tatian was "von Haus aus" (*i. e.*, originally) Syriac. This has been proved especially by Zahn, and also by J. Rendel Harris. Harnack stands practically alone in his contention that it was composed in Greek, and not in Syriac.

But to return to the proof for the statement that the author of the harmony based his work on a Syriac translation of the separate gospels which existed already at his time. I quote from J. Rendel Harris:

One of the most characteristic readings of Tatian has been held to be the expression of Mark (viii. 26), preserved in the Arabic Harmony, where we are told that the Syro-Phenician woman, upon whose daughter the Lord showed compassion, was a native of Emesa (or Homs) of Syria. The reading has, at first sight, every appearance of being an addition to the information in the canonical gospels. If it is really a part of Tatian's text, I can prove, however, that he was working on Syriac gospels. The proof is as follows: The Persian version, which was made from a Syriac text, says the woman was "from Phenice of Syria—*i. e.*, from Homs," from which we suspect that Homs of Syria in Tatian's text is merely an explanation of "Phenice of Syria." And this is confirmed by the dictionary of Bar Ali and a number of other authorities, who tell us that "Phenice of Syria is the city Homs." If, then, Tatian's text had "Homs of Syria," it is explanatory of an earlier text "Phenice of Syria," and this text must have been a translation of the troublesome Greek word "Syro-Phenician." The collateral evidence for the existence of such a translation is abundant. Tatian was, therefore, working on translated gospels. It appears, therefore, that his evidence also, as might have been expected, runs back into a Syriac source.²⁵

²⁵ J. RENDEL HARRIS in the *Contemporary Review*, November, 1894, p. 671. For the other proofs see ZAHN'S *Gesch. d. Kanons*.

We have up to this point seen (1) that there exists an intimate relationship between Ss and T, and (2) that T has based his work on already existing Syriac gospels. Is there now any proof in the text of Ss which shows that the text it represents was earlier than T?

The strongest proof will certainly be in a comparison of passages in which we clearly see the dogmatic character of Tatian. Though, of course, the work of Tatian was made, not for dogmatic and theological, but for practical reasons, we know from some writers that he held certain heretical views, which found expression in the omission of passages which contradicted his views, and which he therefore believed to be wrong.²⁶ There are two points especially: (1) his rejection of marriage, and (2) his opposition to everything which showed the Davidic descent of Jesus.

Now let us compare Matt. 1:19-25:

	Sc	Ss	Arab. Diat.	Ephraim
19.	Now Joseph, because he was a just man	Now Joseph <i>her husband</i> = omits: man	= Ss = Sc = Sc	= Sc = Sc = Sc
20.	Joseph, <i>son of David</i> , do not fear to marry Mary <i>thy betrothed</i>	= Mary <i>thy wife</i>	= Sc = Ss	omits son of David simply: Mary
21.	For she shall bear a son, and his name shall be called Jesus, for he shall save <i>the world</i> from their sins	= <i>thee</i> a son and <i>thou</i> shalt call = <i>his people</i> from =	= Sc = Ss = Ss = Ss	missing
25.	And he married Mary <i>and lived purely with her</i>	= Mary <i>his wife</i> ———	and took <i>his wife</i> and knew her not until she bare her firstborn son	took <i>her</i> = Sc until she bare her firstborn
	until she bare the son and <i>she</i> called his name Jesus	and she bare <i>him</i> a son and <i>he</i> called =	——— ———	——— ———

Now, suppose T were the oldest and Ss were based on it, what reason should Ss have to alter the text of T so much that he has quite a unique text? There is no dogmatic presupposition found in his translation, and everyone who reads this narrative about the birth of Christ is struck by the simplicity and naturalness of Ss, which comes out perhaps most strongly in vs. 16, omitted by T:

²⁶ Cf. especially EUSEBIUS, IV, 29, and THEODORET, I, 20.

Jacob begat Joseph; *Joseph*, to whom was betrothed Mary the virgin, begat *Jesus*, who is called Christ.

The idea that this is the work of a heretic must at once be dismissed, since it has no foundation in the whole translation, which is entirely without theological bias. The text of Ss draws really the correct conclusion from that genealogy. On the other hand, we know that Tatian had dogmatic presuppositions. He never mentions Mary and Joseph as husband and wife. He emphasizes the fact that they lived purely with each other. He omits the genealogies altogether, because they showed the Davidic descent of Christ. Now, in the text of Ss we have —

1. The emphasis on the married relationship of Mary and Joseph.

Ss	Sc	T
Joseph <i>her</i> husband	<i>omits</i> : her husband	=Sc
Mary <i>thy</i> wife	<i>thy</i> bethrothed	omits
married <i>his</i> wife	<i>omits</i> : his wife	=Sc
she shall bear <i>thee</i> a son	<i>omits</i> : <i>thee</i>	
<i>thou</i> shalt call his name	his name shall be called	
<i>he</i> called his name	<i>she</i> called his name	
	adds: lived purely with her	he dwelt with her in purity

2. The Davidic descent of Jesus.

In the genealogies, in the sentence, "Joseph begat Jesus," "Joseph was called the father of Jesus," and especially in vs. 20, "Joseph, *son of David*, do not fear."

While we can find no ground why Ss should have altered Tatian's text into his really unique and unparalleled text, there are strong reasons for supposing that Tatian found this text of Ss and modified it to suit his views.

An objection which might be made to the second argument, as to the Davidic descent of Jesus, must be considered here. Ephraim says in his commentary on the Diatessaron: "Eadem scriptura dixit, utrumque Josephum et Mariam esse ex domo David." (Moesinger, *Evgl. Concord. Expos.*, p. 26.) This seems to contradict the statement that Tatian omitted everything which related to the Davidic descent of Jesus. But one must not be rash in such a conclusion. Ephraim uses the separate gospel text, too; all the citations in his commentary cannot be regarded as belonging to the Diatessaron, and it is conceded that many are from the separate gospels. I would therefore rather trust the eyewitness Theodoret, who had seen copies of the Syriac

work, as we have not. Thus I believe that these words were not in the original Diatessaron, but were taken from the separate gospels. That this is correct is shown by the text of Ss in Luke 2:4, "because *both* were from the house of David;" while P and W-H have: *διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐξ οἴκου καὶ πατρὸς Δαυείδ.*

The second argument is, therefore, valid, and it must be recognized, though the first argument alone would be sufficient for our purpose.

Again, there are peculiarities in Ss which cannot be later than T.²⁷

Another argument for the priority of the separate gospels over against the harmony lies in the omissions of Ss, especially of Mark 16:9-20, the so-called "longer conclusion." Ss omits it, breaking suddenly off with: "for they were afraid." Then we have the colophon, "Here endeth the gospel of Mark," and then begins at once in the same column, showing that nothing has been omitted, the gospel of Luke. Ss did not have vss. 9-16 just as *N*, B. But everybody recognizes that these verses were in the original Diatessaron. Sc has them, too. If Ss had T before him, why, then, did he leave out these verses? No reason whatever can be found for the omission but the one that Ss did not find these verses in the original from which he made his translation. And it is evident, therefore, that this original was not T, for in T these verses are found.

But that is not claimed at all, one might say. Evidently Ss had not only T, but also a Greek MS. before him. He followed the Greek MS.; thus this omission is no reason why Ss should be earlier than T.

This is a natural objection. However, it will be noticed that the omission of those verses occurs in the earliest Greek MS., while only the later Greek texts have the passage. The same applies to the

²⁷ "There is at least one passage where we know the Diatessaron to have contained a peculiar interpretation of the ordinary Greek text, but where Sinaiticus has a striking mistranslation (or a corruption of the underlying Greek text), which could hardly have passed into circulation after the Diatessaron reading was current; *i. e.*, Luke 4:29, *ὥστε κατὰ κρημνίσαι αὐτον*, which was taken by Tatian to imply that the men of Nazareth actually threw our Lord over the cliff. But in Sin. we read: 'And they led him out as far as the top (?) of the mountain upon which their city was built, so as to hang him.' The last clause is evidently meant for *ὥστε κρεμασαι αὐτον*. Such a gross mistranslation must date from very early times." (BURKITT.) Besides, readings like Matt. 27:16, 17, where Ss has "*Jesus Bar-Abbas*," which is also in *Shier*; Luke 2:36, which affirms that Hanna had lived only seven *days* with her husband before she became a widow; Luke 4:29, "He who eats the *ἄριστον* in the kingdom of God," must be very old, and are of such a character that "niemand (*sic*) später in ein Neues Testament hineincorrigiert haben würde." (Cf. NESTLE, *Theolog. Literatur-Zeitung*, *l. c.*)

omission of other passages in Ss which are in T, *e. g.*, Luke 22: 43, 44; 23: 34^b. It is only the earliest MSS. which omit them.

The case lies, then, thus: Ss used an older Greek MS. than T. Is this natural in the case that Ss is later than T? Evidently not.

Besides, it is a great question whether a later author would omit such passages as, *e. g.*, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," a passage which must have immediately taken hold of the hearts of the people when once given. Now, would an author who began his work when this word of Jesus on the cross was already familiar to the people from the harmony which they used, omit it, even though it were not in the Greek MS. from which he translated? Would not the people charge him at once with having omitted some of the most precious parts of the gospel? Would for those simple-minded, earnest, practical Christians an answer be sufficient which told them: these are really not original parts of the gospel, they are later additions? That might do for a modern critic. But one may safely challenge anyone to try today whether the great mass of earnest, devoted Christians would be willing to give up those texts simply because they are not found in the earliest MSS. And then, the whole character of the work of Ss shows that the author's purpose was practical: he wanted to give the people a gospel which they could read and understand; there were none of the elements of the modern text critic in him. His work was for the people. But will the people be willing to accept his work when they could say: "Our old gospel, our Diatessaron, is much better than this new version. It has those words which we love, but this version has omitted them"? Impossible that he should not have thought of this. No; the omission of those passages in Ss shows very clearly that he did not have T before him; that T must be later; else they would have been taken account of, no matter whether the Greek MS. of Ss had them or not.

These arguments from the comparison of dogmatic passages in T and Ss, from the peculiarities of Ss, which would scarcely have found their place after T's work, and from the omissions of Ss, are perhaps as strong arguments as we can expect in the absence of external witness. It is their inherent force which convinces us that the text represented by Ss, the Syr. vet., is older than the Diatessaron, and that the relation that exists between them is the dependence of T on Ss.

There is, however, also a clear influence of T on Ss. And this fact—I refer to the presence of harmonistic readings in Ss—is the main, if not the only real, argument for the opposite view, which affirms the priority of T over against Ss.

That there are such harmonistic readings in Ss is plain from such passages as Mark 8 : 32 ; 7 : 28, and others.²⁸

It is not necessary for our argument to point out the harmonistic readings in Sc. They were already recognized by Cureton, who in his preface, p. lxvi, says :

If we turn to St. Luke, we find several examples of additions made to the text from the other evangelists, who had related some fact or discourse in greater detail, or with some additional circumstances ; of the change of words or phrases to accommodate them and bring them nearer, or even to make them identical with the terms employed in other gospels. The gospel of St. John, from its peculiarity in having less in common than the other three, will necessarily admit of fewer changes of this sort ; but still, even in that small portion of it which remains, indications of this kind are observable. Of Mark only four verses of the last chapter remain. The gospel of St. Matthew also seems to exhibit some signs of a similar nature, especially with regard to additions made to the text.

According to his theory that this Syriac gospel of Matthew represents "more nearly the exact words which the evangelist himself made use of than any other that has hitherto been discovered," Cureton attributes "its approximation in numerous places to the reading found in St. Mark and St. Luke" to this cause, and not to the same to which he ascribes the harmonistic readings in Mark, Luke, and John.

After Cureton, Baethgen especially has called attention to these harmonistic readings, and has made much use of them for his argument

²⁸ Mark 8 : 32, where Ss has : "And Simon Peter, *as though pitying him*, said, 'Be this far from thee.'" This is evidently a conflation of Mark and Matt. The Greek has in Matt. : *καὶ προσλαβόμενος αὐτὸν ὁ Πέτρος ᾤχετο ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῷ λέγων ἰλέως σοὶ κύριε οὐ μὴ εἴσται τούτο.* In Mark : *καὶ προσλαβόμενος ὁ Πέτρος αὐτὸν ᾤχετο ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῷ.* The phrase in Ss, "*as though pitying him*," is plainly a translation of the Greek words *ἰλέως σοὶ* of Matt. Now, exactly the same phrase occurs in the Arabic Diatessaron, which translates : "And Simon Peter, *as if sympathizing with him*, said, 'Be this far from thee, Lord.'" Now, it is true that a b n combine also Matt. and Mark, but the agreement is not so close as in the case of Ss and T.—Matt. 7 : 28, Ss reads : *καὶ τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν πιπτοντῶν ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης* (or *ἀπὸ τῶν τραπέζων*) *τῶν παιδίων.* The Greek has in Matt. *τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν πιπτοντῶν ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τῶν κυρίων* ; in Mark : *τὰ κυνάρια ὑπὸ κατῶ τῆς τραπέζης ἐσθίουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν παιδίων.* Ss omits in Matt. *ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν πιπτοντῶν*, but reads it in Mark, where it is not in the Greek. Ephraim's Diatessaron has : "Even dogs eat of the crumbs of their master's table" = Greek of Mark. Ss takes the *ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν πιπτοντῶν* from Matt., but it retains the reading *τῶν παιδίων.*—For other instances see ZAHN's article in the *Theologische Literatur-Blatt*, 1895, and the transpositions in the passion story, Luke 22 : 16, 19, 20a, 17, 20b, 18, 21 ; John 18 : 13, 24, 14, 15, 19–23, 16–18, 25, which seem to point to a harmony.

of the priority of the Diatessaron. But as to this, it will be sufficient to quote the words of Burkitt in the *Guardian*, October 31, 1894 :

Baethgen brings forward a number of instances of harmonistic readings of Cur., but out of his forty-three examples where Cur. stands alone (or with Diat. only), sixteen, or more than one-third, are not shared by Sin. . . . Matt. 21 : 33-44 is selected by Baethgen to exhibit the harmonistic tendencies of Syr. vet., and of five such readings in these verses peculiar to Cur. alone, three are also found in Sin. Yet even here Sin. shows its independence by passing over vs. 44 altogether, while Cur. and Pesh. follow the ordinary text. The verse is in Diat., where it may, of course, correspond to Luke 20 : 18. Its absence from Sin. in the midst of so many minor harmonistic readings shows that no deliberate attempt at assimilating the gospels one to the other has been made, however much the scribes of Sin. and its ancestors may have been influenced by the wording of parallel verses.

How do we have to account for the harmonistic readings in Ss ? It is easily said : They are due to the influence of the Diatessaron. There is probably nobody who denies it. But suppose the Old Syriac text of the separate gospels were later than the Diatessaron, how have we to think of the work of its author ? He must have had a Greek MS. in his hand—how else could he disentangle the harmony and restore the text of the separate gospels ? He had, then, before him the Syriac harmony and the Greek MS. Which would be the text that he preferred ? Would he simply look for the corresponding translation of the Greek in the Syriac Diatessaron ? Would he omit the passages which the Diatessaron had, indeed, but which were not in the Greek MS. ? Would he add some additions which the Greek text had, but which were wanting in the Diatessaron ? Would he, in the main, take the text from the already existing Syriac translation, disentangling most passages, but not all, so that some harmonistic touches would remain ? Whatever may be said about this theory, it is absolutely improbable. For this procedure he must have known a good deal of Greek. Why should he then undergo this mechanical, slavish task, which, moreover, was more difficult than the direct translation ? No, the whole translation bears the stamp of originality on its face ; such kind of a work would have left other traces which this noble and forcible piece does not show.

But then, one objects and asks, wondering how anyone can set up a theory like this, whether it was not simply so that the author did not have a copy of Tatian's work, but merely a Greek MS., before him ; that he was, however, so familiar with the text of the harmony that there slipped into his translation some harmonistic reminiscences of the Diatessaron.

But, after all, the question arises: If he had the Greek text before him, why should he make these strange excursions? We have no reason to doubt—on the contrary, we have every reason to believe—that he was a very faithful translator. Here is a man who wants to give the Syrian Christians, who have the Diatessaron already, the separate gospels as they were used in the Græco-Roman church. Will he not be careful to shun harmonistic passages, lest he defeat his own end? Besides, the danger of falling into these lapses is not so great as one might at first think. The work which the translator had to do was not altogether mechanical; it was not the wearisome toil of simple copying; there was a good deal of creative work to be done. The mind was profoundly attentive; this his whole work shows. It was something new that he wanted to give to the people. Since the main stock was already there in the harmony, his diligence must be only the greater, lest he represent the Greek original incorrectly.

The copyist who had the mechanical work to do was more likely to write down from memory. One who knows what it is to copy hour after hour, perhaps day after day, knows how the attention becomes distracted and the mind grows weary. Familiar as the scribe of the third or fourth century was with the substance of what he was copying, and knowing the text of the Diatessaron well, he must at times have put down the text of the harmony which was so familiar to him, especially in passages where there was agreement in general. It is much easier to think that the harmonistic elements came into Ss through scribes than that they were due to the original translator, unless it could be proved that the Greek text from which he translated contained these harmonistic touches already. Considerations like these weaken or destroy the argument for the priority of the harmony over against Ss.

And then, even those harmonistic touches which we find in Ss must not all be attributed to the influence of T. This will be seen, for instance in the passage Mark 7 : 28,²⁹ where there is, indeed, a conflation in Ss, but it is found neither in the Ephraim fragments nor in the Arabic Diatessaron. The influence of a parallel passage explains much, and probably some conflations he found already in the Greek MS.³⁰

²⁹ See preceding footnote.

³⁰ Compare for this the words of Jerome in his preface to the gospels, also cited by Cureton: "Magnus si quidem hic in nostris codicibus error inolevit, dum quod in eadem re alius Evangelista plus dixit, in alio quia minus putaverint, addiderunt. Vel dum eundem sensum alius aliter expressit, ille qui unum a quattuor primum legerat, ad ejus exemplum ceteros quoque existimaverit emendandos. Unde accidit ut apud nos mixta sunt omnia, et in Marco plura Lucae atque Matthaei, rursus in Matthaeo plura Johannis et Marci, et in ceteris reliquorum, quae aliis propria sunt, inveniantur."

The result, then, of our investigation as to the relative age of Ss and T is that Ss is earlier than T, that T was not the earliest gospel which the Syrians knew.

Now, what is the relation in which T stands to Sc? We have seen that the text which is represented by Ss is earlier than T. But how about Sc? Is it also earlier, or is it later? I think it is clearly later. The arguments which have been brought forward for the priority of Ss cannot be applied to Sc. Sc is so much like T in the dogmatic portions that no other conclusion seems possible than that it is based on T. It contains, moreover, the conclusion of Mark, as well as the most important other omissions, like Luke 22:43, 44, just as T. Sc apparently presupposes T in its translation. Ss would, then, be the oldest, T would come next, and Sc would come after T. This carries naturally with it the position of P, which is the latest of them all.

Suppose, however, for a moment that the Diatessaron (=T) were the earliest form after all. Then one thing would inevitably follow: Sc must be nearer in time to T than Ss, because Sc has undoubted marks of T's influence, much more so than Ss (*cf.* especially Matt., chap. 1). But this would contradict the result of our investigation, for we saw that Ss was older than Sc, and had strong proofs for it. With this the last foundation of Tatian's priority vanishes. The Diatessaron cannot claim the distinction of having been the first written message of the gospel of Christ in Syria.

The Syrians had, then, the separate gospels in a text which underlies Ss before they had the Diatessaron. Now it will be asked: If they had already Ss, what was the need of having another translation, that of Sc? Was Ss not enough? Here it must not be forgotten that probably for the great mass of the people the Diatessaron was the only form in which they knew the gospels. For the Diatessaron was made at the time when Christianity, from being the religion of individuals, became the religion of the state. To those Christians the Diatessaron was their one and all. They heard it in the church services, and became soon acquainted with it. Naturally they were familiar with Tatian's idea of the birth of Christ. Hearing now from others that the gospels were originally written in four separate accounts, they would be eager to possess them also in that form in which, as they learned, the rest of the Christian churches read them. The desideratum of the hour was, then, for these people, not a work which contradicted the Diatessaron, but one which was in harmony with it, told the narration of the birth in the same words almost as T. A work like Ss would hardly have met their

wishes. To this desire the translation of Sc was due. When it was made we do not know. Perhaps quite early, about 200 A. D., perhaps some fifty years later. How widely it was used it is impossible to say. The same must also be said about the use of Ss; whether it was used extensively or only in small circles is uncertain. That both were made to fulfil a desire on the part of the people cannot be doubted. For practical, not for critical, purposes did the authors write; that people should read and be edified, not that scholars should examine and compare and inquire which was the correct text and which not.

Unless other finds show the contrary, Ss in its original form was the first translation to which we can point with historic certainty. The extraordinary value of Ss for text-critical purposes has at once been recognized.³¹ It seems to stand on the same level of authority as N and B. Merx places it even higher.³² Whether that, however, can be maintained, time will show. But the fact that Ss was written before T, puts it into the middle of the second century, to which the entire text bears witness; and that places it in the front rank of the witnesses for the original Greek text of the gospels.

4. *The Gospel in Aphraates.*

(1) The first thing which confirms the historical presumption that Aphraates used the Diatessaron is the fact that he calls the book from which he quotes at least five times simply "the gospel," "his gospel," "the gospel of our vivifier;"³³ never speaking of it as "the gospels,"

³¹ Ss is used already by BLASS in his edition of Luke (Leipzig, 1897) and by BALJON in his *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Groningen, 1898), who says: "Maioris momenti est codex Syr^{sin}; eius igitur lectiones *diligentissime* conquisitas in annotatione *ubique* (?) adscripsi" (p. iv).

³² Cf. his extremely interesting appendix. He would sometimes take the reading of Ss, even if the entire other tradition be different. Blass also ranks it very high. So would he, just like Merx (and Bechtel), "dem Syrer der Mrs. Lewis glauben, dass es Luc. 17:10 *δοῦλοι ἐσμεν* heissen muss, ohne *ἀχρεῖοι*." (*Gram. d. neutestamentl. Griech.*, p. v.) "At est profecto ubi magna habenda sit vel *solī* vel *paucis* testanti: velut quod omittit L. 17:10 *ἀχρεῖοι* e Matthaeo in sententiae detrimentum invecum, et Johannis narrationem (18:13 sqq.) cum graeco 225 in veriore ordinem redigit, ut desinat non modo cum ceterorum sed etiam secum ipse pugnare videri." (*Luke*, Pref., p. lxxvi). See also footnote 28.

³³ P. 8, "As it is written in the beginning of the gospel of our vivifier;" p. 13, "The word which is written in the gospel;" p. 321, "as was said in the gospel;" p. 235, "as he says in his gospel;" "what the Lord teaches in his gospel" (BERT's edition).

nor ever mentioning the name of a single evangelist. (2) There are harmonistic passages in his homilies which point in the same direction. It is true we cannot control them all, since in many cases Ephraim is wanting and the Arabic has no mixture.³⁴ He might, then, have harmonized himself. But there are enough cases where he has the same mixture as the Arabic or Ephraim, and also where he strings his quotations together so as to follow closely the order of the Diatessaron. They have been discussed by Zahn and Harris. (3) There is at least one passage, Luke 16:28, where Aphraates and the Arabic T have an unparalleled reading, caused by a primitive error in the Greek text, *ὅπως διαμαρτύρηται* fused with *διαμαρτάνω* (Harris, p. 21). (4) Aphraates says that his gospel began, just as the Diatessaron, with John 1:1: "In the beginning was the word." "As it is written *in the beginning* of the gospel of our vivifier: 'In the beginning was the word.'" Not in the beginning of John's gospel—he never says that; but "in the beginning of the gospel of our vivifier." (5) Add to these the fact that there was no other harmony that he could have used; that of Ammonius being different and not used, so far as we know, in Syria, while Tatian's Diatessaron was used; and (6) the fact that there are some quotations which can best be explained on the assumption that they were taken from Tatian's Diatessaron;³⁵ and there can be no reasonable doubt about Aphraates' use of the Diatessaron.

³⁴ *E. g.*, Matt. 5:15; Mark 4:21; Luke 8:16; John 20:2, 13; Matt. 28:6; Luke 17:3, 4; Matt. 18:15 ff.; etc.

³⁵ Matt. 5:4, "Blessed are they who mourn, for they shall be *suppliated*;" *παράκαλειν* is translated "supplicate." Luke 6:24, "Woe unto you rich, who have received your *petition*," *παράκλησις*; 16:25, "But now thou askest and he does not help thee;" Ss, P—"And now he receives rest and thou art tortured;" Sc wanting. Matt. 5:5, "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the *land of life*." John 1:17, "*The truth of the law* has come through Jesus." Matt. 15:19, "*In* the heart are the wicked thoughts." Luke 4:29, *ὥστε κατακρημνίσαι αὐτόν*, evidently taken to imply that the Nazareth people actually threw Jesus over the cliff.

Here belong also some logia of Jesus which we find neither in the separate gospels nor in the Diatessaron as we have it in Ephraim and in the Arabic text. Did Aphraates have also apocryphal gospels in addition to the canonical? The passages are:

1. "What I say to you in darkness, say ye in light, for among the heathen let your light shine" (p. 9). The first sentence is a quotation from Matt. 10:27, and "for among the heathen let your light shine" is similar to Matt. 5:16, "let your light so shine before men." It is, then, a free quotation, not a new logion.

2. "Doubt not that ye may not sink down in the world as Simon, when he doubted and began to sink down in the sea" (p. 15, BERT's edition). Of this Resch says in his *Agrapha (Texte und Untersuchungen, Vol. V, 4, p. 380)*: "Der durchaus

But there are indications that he used also the separate gospels.

1. He has genealogies of Jesus which were not in the Diatessaron. A comparison of the genealogies in Aphraates (=A) with those of Ss, secundäre Zusatz: *wie Simon, da er anfang zu sinken im Meere*, lässt es auch wahrscheinlich werden, dass die vorhergegangenen Worte: *auf dass ihr nicht versinket in der Welt*, ebenfalls der Perikope Mt. 14:28-31 nachgebildet, mithin nicht original sind, zumal da diese Perikope von dem versinkenden Petrus weder durch das petrinische Markusevangelium, Mc. 6:45-51, noch durch die johanneische Parallele, Joh. 6:17-21, gedeckt wird. Als zweifellos echt bleibt im obigen Logion mithin nur der Anfang: *Zweifelt nicht!* Diese Worte sind aber auch schon in den canonischen Evangelien vorhanden: *μη διακριθῆτε*, Mt. 21:21 [which he has cited a little later]. Am meisten klingt noch an den Aphraatestext Jac. 1:16."

3. "As it is written: The supplicant who offers his prayer must first examine his gift well, if a stain be found on it, and then shall he offer it, that his sacrifice may not remain on the earth" (BERT, p. 66). "Es ist doch wohl nur eine Nachbildung von Mt. 5:23, 24, die wir hier vor uns haben. Man vergleiche namentlich das dreimalige *δωρον* = 'Gabe' in der kanonischen Parallele und die Übereinstimmung in den Worten *καὶ τότε ἔλθων προσφερε τὸ δῶρον σου*." (RESCH, *l. c.*, p. 442.)

4. "As it is written: Our Lord said: Pray and do not become weary" (BERT, p. 66); Resch says: "Dieses Logion findet sich als Herrenwort nirgends im Canon. Wohl aber bietet Lucas einen verwandten Text: *εἰπεν δὲ παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς πρὸς τὸ δεῖν παντοτε προσευχεσθαι καὶ μὴ εγκακεῖν*, Lc. 18:1. Von mancher Seite ist diese lucanische Bemerkung als ein von dem Evangelisten ex suis hinzugethaner überflüssiger Zusatz bezeichnet und der Ursprung dieses lucanischen Zusatzes in den paulinischen Ausdrücken gesucht worden: *μη εγκακησατε*, 2. Thess. 3:13; *μη εγκακωμεν*, Gal. 6:9; *διο αιτουμαι μη εγκακειν*, Eph. 3:13; *ουκ εγκακουμεν*, 2. Cor. 4:1, 16. Durch das oben angeführte Herrenwort wird der Sachverhalt gerade ins Gegentheil verkehrt. Die paulinischen Parallelen sind Nachklänge von diesem Herrenwort, und Lucas hat ebendasselbe Herrenwort *προσευχεσθε καὶ μὴ εγκακησατε* lediglich aus der direkten in die indirekte Rede umgewandelt, indem er zugleich den ursprünglichen Standort jenes Logion in der vorcanonischen Quelle deutlich erkennen lässt. Zu vergleichen ist auch Herm. Mand., IX, 8, p. 104: 11, *συ ουν μη διαλειπης αιτουμενος το αιτημα της ψυχης σου, καὶ ληψη αυτο. εαν δε εκκακησης καὶ διψυχησης αιτουμενος, σεαυτον αιτιω καὶ μη τον διδοντα σοι*. Übrigens schwanken in allen kanonischen wie auch in dieser Hermas-Parallele die Lesarten zwischen *εκκακειν* und *εγκακειν*." (Pp. 297, 298.)

It is, however, just as well possible that Aphraates made the change from the indirect into the direct form; or, what is still more probable, he found it so in Tatian's Diatessaron. Aphraates' testimony is not sufficient to prove the assertion that this is a word of Jesus. But in any case, even if Resch be correct, the use of this text does not necessitate the opinion that Aphraates used an extra-canonical gospel beside the Diatessaron.

5. "For it stands written thus: The good is destined to come, and well for him through whom it comes; and the evil is destined to come, but woe to him through whom it comes." Resch compares with this: DRESSSEL, *Clementina Epitome prima*, chap. 96: *ο κυριος ημων Ιησους Χριστος ο υιος του θεου εφη: τα αγαθα ελθειν δει, μακαριος δε, φησιν, δι' ου ερχεται. ομοιως αναγκη και τα κακα ελθειν, οναι δε δι' ου ερχεται*, and DRESSSEL, *Clementina Epitome secunda*, chap. 96: *ο κυριος ημων Ιησους Χριστος ο υιος*

Sc, P shows only one real difference³⁶ in that long list of sixty-five names: A has Jojakim and Jojakin, while Ss, Sc, P have Jechonja. It would be extremely hazardous to deny on the basis of this one difference that A took his genealogical lists from the separate gospels. His lists are not exactly like either Ss, Sc, or P; now they approach this form, now that form of the separate gospels;³⁷ they are most closely related to Sc, where Sc is extant. He had probably a copy which combined the different readings or all three texts (perhaps also another?). There is no evidence for the existence of separate genealogical tables, and it is therefore the most probable thing that A took his genealogies from the separate gospels, especially in view of the fact that he ends them with the remark that "Joseph was called the father of Jesus," which is evidently a citation from Ss, where it occurs just so. If he used only the Diatessaron, how could he know this, since Tatian omitted both the genealogies and the references to the Davidic descent? Strange that he should use the same expression as Ss, when he made, as some think, the tables himself on the basis of the Old Testament!

2. There are, moreover, some quotations which Aphraates could by no means have taken from Tatian, since they ran counter to Tatian's belief and emphasized that which Tatian wanted to combat, viz., the Davidic descent of Jesus.

του θεου εφη· τα αγαθα ελθειν δει, μακαριος δε, φησιν, δι' ου ερχεται. ομοιως και τα κακα αναγκη ελθειν, ουαι δε τω ανθρωπω δι ου ερχεται. Resch says: "Durch den von Aphraates überlieferten, ihm aus einer schriftlichen Autorität zugeflossenen Text, welcher mit dem Homilien-Citate (*Hom. Cl.*, XII, 29, p. 130, 35): ο της αληθειας προφητης εφη· τα αγαθα ελθειν δει, μακαριος δε, φησιν, δι' ου ερχεται· ομοιως και τα κακα αναγκη ελθειν, ουαι δε δι' ου ερχεται—wörtlich übereinstimmt, erfährt die Güte der in den Clementinen fließenden vorzüglichen Evangelienquelle eine neue Bestätigung. Andererseits wird durch diese Vergleichung mit dem Clementinen-Citate offenbar, was man aus Aphraates allein nicht zu erkennen vermag, dass die von ihm citierte schriftliche Autorität ein Herrenwort in sich schloss, für dessen Echtheit somit nunmehr drei Zeugen: Paulus [Rm. 3:8], Pseudo-Clemens und Aphraates sich nachweisen lassen, abgesehen von dem ersten und dritten kanonischen Evangelisten, welche die zweite Hälfte des Logion ebenfalls verwendet haben."

The only safe conclusion which we can draw from this is that Aphraates took this logion from the Diatessaron.

There is absolutely no necessity to believe that Aphraates used an apocryphal gospel. All the differences may be accounted for otherwise quite satisfactorily. Indeed, some of these passages form a negative argument for the fact that Aphraates used the Diatessaron.

³⁶ Arpakohar and Abiur of Ss are evidently copyists' errors: 3 for 2. No. 13 A om., Ss Ailan, P Cainan—very probably also om. by Sc, which is wanting here; cf. 41-43, where the opposite case occurs.

³⁷ 30, A = Ss > P; 32, A = P > Ss; 41-43, A = Sc > Ss, P.

The first citation is already mentioned: "Joseph was called the father of Jesus."

The second is: Luke 2:4, "Jesus was born by the virgin Mary from the seed of the house of David, as it is written: Joseph and Mary his betrothed *were both from the house of David.*" Which statement was not in the Diatessaron, but in the Sinaiticus. (P has the regular Greek reading: "because he was of the house and lineage of David;" Sc is missing.)

We have, then, in Aphraates (1) the genealogies and (2) the Davidic descent of Jesus; both matters were not in Tatian; their text agrees with that of the separate gospels; consequently, Aphraates used in addition to the Diatessaron the separate gospels.

But now the question arises: In which form does he use the separate gospels, in the Sinaitic, Curetonian, or Peshitta text? This involves an examination of the different quotations which Aphraates makes. The comparison now follows:

MATTHEW	A	P	Ss	Sc
2:20	ܡܚܠܐ	ܡܚܠܐ	= A	= P
	om.	ܡܚܠܐ	= P	= P
	ܡܚܠܐ ܡܚܠܐ	ܡܚܠܐ ܡܚܠܐ	= P	= P
	ܡܚܠܐ	ܡܚܠܐ	= P	= P
	ܡܚܠܐ	ܡܚܠܐ	= P	= P
	ܡܚܠܐ	om.	om.	= A
3:2	ܡܚܠܐ ܡܚܠܐ	om.	om.	om.
4:11	ܡܚܠܐ ܡܚܠܐ	ܡܚܠܐ ܡܚܠܐ	ܡܚܠܐ ܡܚܠܐ	= P
	ܡܚܠܐ	ܡܚܠܐ	ܡܚܠܐ	= Ss
5:3	ܡܚܠܐ	ܡܚܠܐ	= A	= A
5:9	ܡܚܠܐ ܡܚܠܐ	ܡܚܠܐ ܡܚܠܐ	= A	= A
5:13	ܡܚܠܐ	= A	= A	ܡܚܠܐ
5:14	ܡܚܠܐ	= A	ܡܚܠܐ	= A
	ܡܚܠܐ	ܡܚܠܐ	= A	= A
	ܡܚܠܐ	= A	ܡܚܠܐ	= Ss
5:18	ܡܚܠܐ ܡܚܠܐ	ܡܚܠܐ ܡܚܠܐ	= A	= A
				but adds
	ܡܚܠܐ ܡܚܠܐ	ܡܚܠܐ ܡܚܠܐ		ܡܚܠܐ ܡܚܠܐ
	but also		= P	= P
	ܡܚܠܐ ܡܚܠܐ	om. ܡܚܠܐ		
	ܡܚܠܐ	= A	= A	ܡܚܠܐ

MATTHEW	A	P	Ss	Sc
5:19	וְהַכֹּתֵם מַכְסֵי	וְהַכֹּתֵם מַכְסֵי	= P	= Ss
	מַכְסֵי	מַכְסֵי	but om. מַכְסֵי	
	מַכְסֵי	מַכְסֵי	= P	= P
	וְהַכֹּתֵם מַכְסֵי	וְהַכֹּתֵם מַכְסֵי	מַכְסֵי	= P
	מַכְסֵי	מַכְסֵי	rest = P	but om. מַכְסֵי
5:23	אֲנִי מַכְסֵי	אֲנִי מַכְסֵי	אֲנִי מַכְסֵי	= P
	מַכְסֵי	מַכְסֵי	except מַכְסֵי	מַכְסֵי
	אֲנִי מַכְסֵי	אֲנִי מַכְסֵי	= P except מַכְסֵי	מַכְסֵי for מַכְסֵי (cf. A)
	אֲנִי מַכְסֵי	אֲנִי מַכְסֵי	מַכְסֵי (= A)	מַכְסֵי
	אֲנִי מַכְסֵי	אֲנִי מַכְסֵי	אֲנִי מַכְסֵי	מַכְסֵי
	אֲנִי מַכְסֵי	אֲנִי מַכְסֵי	מַכְסֵי	מַכְסֵי
	אֲנִי מַכְסֵי	אֲנִי מַכְסֵי	else = P	else = P
5:29	om.	וְהַכֹּתֵם	= P	= P
	מַכְסֵי	מַכְסֵי	= P	= A
	מַכְסֵי	מַכְסֵי	= A	= P
5:30	om.	וְהַכֹּתֵם	om. vs. 30	= P
5:35	אֲנִי	om.	om.	om.
	וְהַכֹּתֵם	= A	= A	מַכְסֵי
	מַכְסֵי	= A	מַכְסֵי	= A
5:36	אֲנִי מַכְסֵי	אֲנִי מַכְסֵי	אֲנִי מַכְסֵי	= A
5:39-41	om.	וְהַכֹּתֵם	= A	= A
	מַכְסֵי	אֲנִי	= A	[אֲנִי]
	מַכְסֵי	= A	= A	מַכְסֵי
	מַכְסֵי	om.	= A	= A
	אֲנִי	om.	= A	= A
	וְהַכֹּתֵם	וְהַכֹּתֵם	= P	= P
	מַכְסֵי	מַכְסֵי	(= A) מַכְסֵי	= P
	מַכְסֵי	מַכְסֵי	= P	= P
	om.	מַכְסֵי	= A	= P
6:6	מַכְסֵי	מַכְסֵי	= A	= A
	מַכְסֵי	מַכְסֵי	= A	= A
	מַכְסֵי	מַכְסֵי	= P	= P
	מַכְסֵי	מַכְסֵי	= P + om.	= P
	om.	מַכְסֵי	= A	= A

[illegible]

MATTHEW	A	P	Ss	Sc
18:20	זל	אמא יינ	חמא יינ	= P + חמא יינ
	זלזל	זל זל	= P	= P
	זל זל זל זל	= A	זל זל זל	= A
18:21	om.	= A	= A	חמא יינ
	חמא יינ	חמא יינ	חמא יינ	= P
	זל	זל זל זל	= A	חמא יינ
	חמא יינ	חמא יינ	= A	= A
	זל	חמא יינ	= A	= A
18:35	זל	זל	= A	= A
19:28	חמא יינ	חמא יינ	= A	= A
21:38	זל	= A	זל	חמא יינ
21:43	חמא יינ	חמא יינ	= A	= P
21:44	חמא יינ	חמא יינ	omits this verse	= A
	חמא יינ	חמא יינ		except
	חמא יינ	חמא יינ		זל for
	חמא יינ	חמא יינ		זל
22:27	זל זל זל	זל זל זל	= P	חמא יינ
	זל זל זל	זל זל זל	חמא יינ	חמא יינ
	זל זל זל	זל זל זל	missing	= P
cf. Ss, Sc, vs. 30				
	om.	חמא יינ	missing	= P
	om.	= A	זל זל	= Ss
	חמא יינ	om.	= A	= A
22:29	זל	זל	= A	= A
	זל	= A	= A	זל
22:30	חמא יינ	חמא יינ	חמא יינ	= Ss
	חמא יינ	חמא יינ	חמא יינ	
	חמא יינ	חמא יינ	חמא יינ	
	חמא יינ	om.	= P	= A
	חמא יינ	זל	= P	= P
	חמא יינ	חמא יינ	= P	= P
	חמא יינ	om.	om.	om.
	חמא יינ			

MATTHEW	A	P	Ss	Sc
22: 30	ܥܠܝܗ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܕܝܢܐ	ܐܠܐ ܐܡܪ ܕܕܝܢܐ ܕܡܡܬܐ ܐܡܡܬܐ	missing ܕܕܝܢܐ ܕܡܡܬܐ	= P ܕܡܡܬܐ
	ܡܡܬܐ ܕܡܡܬܐ	om.	om.	om.
22: 31	ܕܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ	ܕܡܠܟܐ om.	ܕܡܠܟܐ } ܡܡܬܐ } om.	= P om. om.
	ܕܐܡܝܢ ܕܝܢܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ	ܡܡܬܐ ܕܐܡܝܢ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܝܢܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ	ܕܐܡܝܢ ܕܝܢܐ } = P = P = P	= Ss = P = P
	ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ	ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ } ܡܡܬܐ } ܐܠܐ ܡܡܬܐ	= A = A = P	= A = A = P
23: 15	ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ	ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ	= P	= P
23: 25, 27	ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ	ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ cf. first line ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ	= P = P = A = A = P	missing
	ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ om. ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ	ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ om.	= P = A = A	missing
	ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ	ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ	but om.	
	ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ	ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ	= A = A	
24: 20	ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ	= A	ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ	missing
	ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ	ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ	= P	
25: 34	ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ	ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ ܡܡܬܐ	missing	missing

[illegible]

MATTHEW	A	P	Ss	Sc
28 : 20	ܕܡܠܟܐ but also : ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ	ܕܡܠܟܐ	missing	missing
MARK	A	P	Ss	Sc
5 : 41	ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ	ܕܡܠܟܐ	missing	missing
9 : 24	ܡܢܗ ܡܢܡܠܟܐ ܡܢܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ	om. ܡܢܡܠܟܐ ܡܢܡܠܟܐ	= A ܡܢܡܠܟܐ ܡܢܡܠܟܐ	missing missing
16 : 16	ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ	ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ	om. this conclusion of Mark	missing
16 : 17	ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ om. ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ	ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ = A ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ	omits = A ܡܠܟܐ	missing = A + = A ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ = P, but position of words is different
LUKE	A	P	Ss	Sc
1 : 13	ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ } ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ	= A om.	ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ	missing
1 : 30	ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ	ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ	missing	missing
1 : 48	ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ	ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ	= A	missing
2 : 4	ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ } ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ	= W-H	= A	missing
2 : 14	ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ	ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ	ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ	missing

LUKE	A.	P.	Ss	Sc
2:14	אֵלֵּי	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	missing
	but also:	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	
	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ = Ss (P = וּמִשְׁכָּנָא)	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	
	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ twice in A, neither in P nor Ss	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	
	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ from P	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	
		וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ from Ss	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	
		וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ from P	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	
		וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ from Sc	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	
3:8	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	
	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	= A וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ = Ss except	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	
	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ (= A, P)	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	
6:24	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ = A	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	missing
	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	om.	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	
6:30	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	missing
	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	
6:45	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ = P	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	missing
	but also = P			
	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ = P	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	
	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	= A וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	
7:14	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ } = P	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	missing
	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	
8:52	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ = P	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	= A
	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	the same in the parallel Matt. 9:24	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	missing in Matt.
9:59, 60	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	om.	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	
10:19	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	= P
	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	= P
		וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	
12:19	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	= Ss
	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	
	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	= Ss
	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	= P
	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	= P
	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	= P
	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	וּמִשְׁכָּנָא בְּטָ	= A

[illegible]

LUKE	A	P	Ss	Sc
19:8	ܘܥܠ ܕܥܝܢܐ	ܘܥܠ ܕܥܝܢܐ	= A	= A
	ܘܥܠ ܕܥܝܢܐ	ܘܥܠ ܕܥܝܢܐ		
	ܘܥܠ ܕܥܝܢܐ	ܘܥܠ ܕܥܝܢܐ	} = Ss	
19:9	ܥܡܐ	ܥܡܐ	= A	= A
20:35	ܕܥܡܐ	ܕܥܡܐ	= Ss	
	om.	= A	= A	ܥܡܡܐ
	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	ܥܡܡܐ	= A	= A
	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	ܥܡܡܐ	om.	= P
	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	= P	= P
	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	but om.	
20:36	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	} = Ss	
	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	= Ss	
	om.	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	= Ss	
	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	om.	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	
	om.	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	
20:38	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	= P	= P
21:23	ܥܡܐ	ܥܡܐ	= P	= P
	ܥܡܐ	ܥܡܐ	= P	= P
23:43	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	= A	= A	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ
(twice)	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	= P	= A
JOHN	A	P	Ss	Sc
1:5 (twice)	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	missing	= A
1:14 (twice)	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	missing	= A
1:51	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	missing	missing
	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	missing	missing
2:19	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	= P	missing
	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	
	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	om.		
	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	missing	missing
3:12	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	ܥܡܐ ܥܡܡܐ	= A	

JOHN	A	P	Ss	Sc
3:12	חַמֵּץ בְּלֹא חֶמֶץ מְצֵלֵם			missing
	אֲנִי אֶחָד אֶל אֶחָד	אֲנִי אֶחָד אֶל	אֲנִי אֶחָד אֶל	= Ss
	חַמֵּץ בְּלֹא חֶמֶץ	אֲנִי אֶחָד חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	אֲנִי אֶחָד חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	Ss, Sc differ from A only in the position and in the suff. of the last word
	בְּמִצְרַיִם		אֲנִי אֶחָד חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	
	אֲנִי אֶחָד חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	אֲנִי אֶחָד חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	אֲנִי אֶחָד חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	
3:13	אֲנִי אֶחָד	אֲנִי אֶחָד	= P	= P
	בְּמִצְרַיִם אֲנִי אֶחָד	בְּמִצְרַיִם אֲנִי אֶחָד	= P	= A
	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	= A	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	= A
3:34	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	= A
	חַמֵּץ אֲנִי אֶחָד	חַמֵּץ אֲנִי אֶחָד	חַמֵּץ אֲנִי אֶחָד	missing
	also אֲנִי אֶחָד			
3:35	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	missing	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם
	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	= P
			חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	

This variation in A is due to the verse in Matt. 21:27, which he quotes immediately following this.

5:22	אֲנִי אֶחָד אֶל אֶחָד	אֲנִי אֶחָד אֶל אֶחָד	= Sc	= A
	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם		only adding חַמֵּץ
	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	= A	= A
5:25	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	missing	= P
	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם		= A
	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם		= P
5:28, 29	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	missing	= A
	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם		om.
	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם		om.
6:55	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	= A	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם
	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	= P	= P
	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	= P	= P
6:59	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	= A	= P
7:37 (twice)	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	= Ss
10:9	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	= A	missing
	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	
	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	חַמֵּץ בְּמִצְרַיִם	

JOHN	A	P	Ss	Sc
13:34	ܘܠܥܨܐ	ܘܠܥܨܐܐ	ܘܠܥܨܐܐ	missing
		ܘܠܥܨܐܐ	ܘܠܥܨܐܐ	
14:2	ܐܠܥܝܠܐ	ܐܠܥܝܠܐ	= A	missing
14:3 (twice)	ܐܠܥܝܠܐ	ܐܠܥܝܠܐ	= A	missing
	ܐܠܥܝܠܐ	ܐܠܥܝܠܐ	= A	
14:23	ܐܠܥܝܠܐ	= A	= A	ܐܠܥܝܠܐ
	ܐܠܥܝܠܐ	= A	ܐܠܥܝܠܐ	ܐܠܥܝܠܐ
14:27	ܘܠܥܨܐ	om.	om.	om.
15:12	ܘܠܥܨܐ	ܘܠܥܨܐ	= P	missing
(several times)				
19:36	ܘܠܥܨܐ	ܘܠܥܨܐ	missing	missing
	ܘܠܥܨܐ	ܘܠܥܨܐ		
20:13	ܐܠܥܝܠܐ	ܐܠܥܝܠܐ	= P	missing
	ܐܠܥܝܠܐ	ܐܠܥܝܠܐ	= P	missing
	ܐܠܥܝܠܐ	ܐܠܥܝܠܐ	= P	missing

The comparison printed here shows that the text of Aphraates is in 53 cases like that of P, in 91 = Ss, in 76 = Sc, and in a great many others different from all three.

Now, subtract from the number of cases where $A = P$ all those cases where either Ss or Sc is missing, or both, and where one might reasonably suppose that the texts agreed with P and A. Subtract also those cases from P's number where either Ss or Sc is together with $P = A$. Take into consideration all possible amount of free quotation, and the result is that in spite of it all there are enough passages left which show that Aphraates knew and used the Peshitto text of the four gospels.

Apply the same process of subtraction, with the appropriate modifications, to Ss and Sc, and the result is that Aphraates knew and used the text of both Ss and Sc in his quotations from the gospels.

This is a rather remarkable and unexpected result of the comparison, yet the proof is *lucē clarius*.

But how are we to explain this fact that Aphraates used the Diatessaron, the Peshitto, Ss, and Sc? It may be that he had a text of the separate gospels which had combined the readings of Ss and Sc and P; and for this the peculiarities in the text of Aphraates might lend at least a slender foundation. I mean such little matters as the frequent use of ܘܠܥܨܐ in A, which is not so often in P, Ss, Sc; or the

very frequent use of , for other prepositions, *e. g.*, ܐܠܝܗܐ, ܐܠܝܡܝܐ, and ܐܠܝܡܝܐ; or the use of the plural where the other texts have the singular. But all these differences may be due to Aphraates' loose method of quoting passages. Moreover, the suggestion is only a conjecture, and cannot be substantiated. Perhaps some discovery may throw fresh light on this problem.

The easiest solution seems to me something like the following: Aphraates, the bishop of the monastery of Mar Mattai, was an educated man. One may deny that he was a fine scholar; that he was an earnest and diligent Bible student none will question who has read his homilies. If anyone, he must have known and used the text of the separate gospels. One has only to remember that the ground text of Ss was made already in the second century, and Sc certainly not later than 250 A. D., if not about 200 A. D. These two he evidently used privately for his Bible study. Now about the Peshitto. Suppose it had come into existence about his time (340 A. D.). As bishop he must have become at once familiar with the new work, be it that he met it on his visits in his diocese, where perhaps the priests might use it here or there, or be it that the translation was at once shown to him, the bishop, when it was completed. However that may be, his extensive use of it favors rather an earlier date for the origin of the Peshitto. We have, then, in Aphraates nothing else than this: a man who faithfully studies the Bible in the Diatessaron as well as in the three versions existing in his time, writes some homilies, and here, in quoting from memory (there is no doubt that he did that), quotes now from this, now from that text, apparently without being conscious that he is doing something extraordinary.

This shows us very clearly that the text was not yet settled in the Syrian church. The church had not yet said: "This is our text, not that." We are still in the period of formation, and considerable fluctuation is seen. The strife for the supremacy of the text has not yet broken out openly, but it is about to do so; the Diatessaron is no more exclusively used; on the contrary, the separate gospels seem to have been made more use of. Which of the two parties is going to win? If the separate gospels, which of the three will carry off the victory? The answer we find in the next few decades, during which Ephraim wrote.

5. *The Gospels in Ephraim.*

Rev. F. H. Woods has collated the quotations of Ephraim, and published the results of his investigation in the *Studia Biblica et*

Ecclesiastica (Oxford, 1891), Vol. III, pp. 105 ff., under the title, "An Examination of the New Testament Quotations of Ephraem Syrus." Since he has given the variations from the Peshitta, etc., in full on pp. 120 ff., "Quotations from the New Testament in Ephraem Syrus compared with the Peshitta," etc., I refer to that comparison as the basis of the following assertions, though the conclusions of his article differ from my own.

First of all, it is at once plain that Ephraem knew and used the Diatessaron. He wrote a commentary on it, as we know. Besides, the many passages given in Mr. Woods' list where combinations of the different gospels are found to show the same. There can be no doubt that he used the Diatessaron. But it is also clear that he did not use it frequently in his other works outside of the commentary on it. Most of his quotations are taken from the Peshitta. That was his main text. One sees at once that he uses it much more than Aphraates did. But P was not the only, though the principal, version from which he quoted. There are citations whose text is like Sc and Ss, and different from P.

So is in Matt. 3:17 and 17:5 the curious reading of Ephraim ܡܫܝܚܐ instead of ܡܫܝܚܐ (P) found in Sc as well as in Ss. Similarly 21:38 was cited from Sc or Ss, not from P.—Matt. 5:39 and Luke 6:29a are taken from Sc, not from P, Ss; so also Matt. 16:26, Mark 8:36, and Luke 9:25 ܠܐ = Sc against P and Ss.—Luke 10:24 is quoted from Sc, not from P or Ss.—John 1:3 is as clear a case as one might wish to show that Ephraim used also Sc; here Ephraim agrees in three points with Sc, while he differs in those points from P.

Evidences for the fact that Ephraim used also Ss are such passages as Matt. 10:6 (Sc is wanting), where Ephraim omits with Ss against P ܡܫܝܚܐ, and Ss writes for ܡܫܝܚܐ of P ܡܫܝܚܐ, Ephraim ܡܫܝܚܐ.—Matt. 20:22 = Mark 10:38, where P has ܡܫܝܚܐ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܡܫܝܚܐ (in both passages), Sc agrees with P in Matt. 20:22, is missing in Mark 10:38, but Ss writes in both passages exactly like Ephraim ܡܫܝܚܐ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܡܫܝܚܐ.—Luke 11:2, P = Sc, but Ephraim omits with Sc ܡܫܝܚܐ. Also the best Greek MSS. omit *ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*.—In John 17:11 (Sc wanting) Ss writes with Ephraim ܡܫܝܚܐ, P ܡܫܝܚܐ, though adding with P ܡܫܝܚܐ, which Ephraim omits; but Ss inserts, just as Ephraim, before ܡܫܝܚܐ the word ܡܫܝܚܐ.

These passages make it clear that Ephraim used, besides his Peshitta text, also the Curetonian and Sinaitic texts. It may be that he had a text which combined the readings of all three texts, such as

we see it, for instance, in Luke 14 : 31, where he combines the reading of P, Ss, Sc, and reads both (P) ܐܡܪ ܡܝܬܐ (Ss, Sc). Or it may be that he read all three texts side by side, and in quoting from memory used now this, now that text.

It is not at all necessary that Ephraim knew the differences between the Syriac and Greek texts, or that he had a Greek text before him. All the quotations are easily accounted for by attributing them to these three, or better four, sources, T, P, Ss, Sc.

We see that even in Ephraim the text of the gospels is not yet settled. He still uses the Diatessaron, but it is no longer the main text. The victory in the battle between the two sets of texts, the harmony and the separate gospels, has turned toward the latter. Still, the final step is not yet taken. The one is not absolutely defeated, the other not yet alone in the field. No final decision is reached as yet.

And between the three texts of the separate gospels the relative positions are different now. Aphraates uses more Ss and Sc than P, but Ephraim quotes far more from P than from Ss and Sc combined. Ss and Sc are still used by him, are still influencing his citations, but his main text is P. But also here, though there is a strong tide in favor of P, a decision is not yet reached. But what it will ultimately be is already clear. Ephraim points too clearly the way to be misleading.

II. THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES AND THE EPISTLES.

1. *In the Doctrina Addai.*

The Doctrina Addai speaks of the Acts of the Apostles and the epistles as follows : " But the law, and the prophets, and the gospel, which ye read every day before the people, and the epistles of Paul, which Simon Peter sent us from the city of Rome, and the Acts of the twelve apostles, which John, the son of Zebedee, sent us from Ephesus ; these books read ye in the churches of Christ, and with these read not any others, as there is not any other in which the truth that ye hold is written, except these books, which retain you in the faith to which ye have been called." (P. 44.)

There are no quotations made either from the Acts of the Apostles or from the epistles of Paul, a fact which is in harmony with the purpose of the book. The catholic epistles and the Revelation are not included in the canon of the church.

The bearing of the quotations on the history of the canon may better be discussed under the reconstruction of the history of the canon later on. Here it suffices to have quoted the testimony and the extent of the canon as given in the *Doctrina Addai*.

2. In *Aphraates*.

Aphraates quotes from the Acts of the Apostles several times. Of Paul's epistles he quotes Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Timothy, and Titus; the letter to the Hebrews is also cited as Pauline throughout. He does not cite 2 Thessalonians and Philemon. There is no trace of the catholic epistles and the Revelation. The passages cited by Wright as referring to 1 Peter 4:18 and 1 John 3:24; 4:15 have been shown by Zahn not to refer to those passages. In the first passage it is a citation from "*Solomon*" (Prov. 11:31); the other citation is evidently taken from the gospel of John, and not from the epistle. Strangely enough, Parisot and Gwynn still maintain, with no ground, that he uses 1 John, and they infer from it his use of the rest.

The extent of his canon as regards Acts and the epistles of Paul is the same as that of the *Doctrina Addai*. He quotes a good deal from them, most of his quotations being from 1 Corinthians.

Whether Aphraates' epistle text is the same as that of the Peshitta or not is a question which we must now seek to answer. The Peshitta has, in addition to the epistles of Paul, also the epistle of James, 1 Peter, and 1 John, which Aphraates has not. Is his epistle text, in spite of this, the same as that of the Peshitta, which might not yet have had these epistles in Aphraates' time, or is it different? This necessitates

A Comparison of the Acts and Epistles in Aphraates with those of the Peshitta.

Acts 14:22, A ܐܠܠܗܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܕܡܪܝܡ, P ܐܠܠܗܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ. The Greek has *διὰ πολλῶν θλάσεων* = A.—19:3, A ܡܠܝܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܕܡܪܝܡ, P ܡܠܝܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܕܡܪܝܡ.

Rom. 1:3, 4, A (introduced by ܡܠܝܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܕܡܪܝܡ) ܡܠܝܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܕܡܪܝܡ, P ܡܠܝܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܕܡܪܝܡ. The quotation is free, but in the main there is agreement. There is a difference between ܡܠܝܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܕܡܪܝܡ and ܡܠܝܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܕܡܪܝܡ and in ܡܠܝܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܕܡܪܝܡ and ܡܠܝܟܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ ܕܡܪܝܡ. And here it is to be noticed that the Greek

But one cannot deny that Aphraates differs in a good many passages from the Peshitta in such a way that the differences cannot be explained on the ground of inaccurate quotation, even if we allow all legitimate freedom for quotations from memory. For, strangely enough, quite frequently the variation in Aphraates can be found also in Greek texts. How could he, for instance, have gotten from the Peshitta that strange reading of 1 Cor. 15 : 51 which he quotes three times? He agrees with the best Greek MS., $\aleph$, while P has the ordinary reading. If the canon holds good here that the more difficult reading is the older and more original, then A has here an older text than P. Again in 1 Cor. 15 : 55 A's reading is the regular reading of the Greek MSS., while P's is by no means so common. In 1 Cor. 9 : 5 both texts represent two different traditions of the Greek text. Besides these variations there are different translations of the same Greek text, some occurring so often as to leave no room for the thought that this is an inaccurate quotation of A from P; *e. g.*, Hebr. 4 : 9 (thrice); Eph. 2 : 6 (twice); 1 Cor. 15 : 40 (twice); 2 Cor. 5 : 18 (twice); and in one case at least the translation of a Greek word which Aphraates gives is also given by Crysostom and Theophylact, *viz.*, Gal. 5 : 12 ἀποκόψονται = "utinam genitalibus excendantur," P = "utinam praescindendo praescindantur."

All this points to a different text of the Acts and the epistles from that of P. The difficulty is that we have no other text. But there is no reason to believe that Aphraates knew Greek, and that he used a Greek MS. alongside of his Peshitta text. There must have been at least one different text from P for Acts and epistles; the case of the gospels would thus be paralleled. To my mind there is no doubt in regard to this.

Can we express any opinion as to the relation of this text to that of P? It used a different Greek text as its basis—that is plain from the preceding. Perhaps such passages as Acts 19 : 3, where A has, "Are ye baptized?" P = "With what are ye baptized?" 2 Tim. 3 : 16, A = "Everything which is *in the Spirit of God*," P = "Every writing which is *written by the Spirit of God*;" Rom. 1 : 3, 4, A ὁσι, P ܡܫܝܚܐ; 1 Cor. 1 : 30; 1 Cor. 10 : 27, where A adds (with others) εἰς δέιπνον, so as to make the Greek term καλεῖ more intelligible to the Syrians; 1 Cor. 15 : 40; 15 : 36–38; 2 Cor. 9 : 6—permit us to say (though only tentatively) that the Aphraates text had a more primitive and natural style, not so concerned to express the fine shades of difference in theology as P, *e. g.*, 2 Tim. 3 : 16; Rom. 5 : 14.

3. *Ephraim.*

While Aphraates used only the Acts of the Apostles and the epistles of Paul, including among them the epistle to the Hebrews, Ephraim uses also the catholic epistles and the Revelation, so that he quotes from every New Testament book that is in our Bible. Now, the Peshitta did not contain all of them; it omitted 2 and 3 John, 2 Peter, and Revelation. Where Ephraim quoted these passages from is a question. It may be that he quoted them from a Greek MS., but it is much more probable that already in his time there were translations of these books current, though they were not taken into the canon of the New Testament.

But, leaving these quotations alone, one naturally asks: Are Ephraim's quotations from the other books which are in the Peshitta like the text of P, or different from it?

Again I refer here to the collation made by Rev. F. H. Woods in *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, Vol. III, pp. 132 ff.

What strikes one first of all is the fact that in the main Ephraim quotes from the Peshitta. There are, however, also in Ephraim instances where he has a different translation of the same Greek text, e. g., Eph. 4:3; 2 Cor. 7:2; Eph. 3:19. But they are not so frequent as in Aphraates.

There are also a few references in which Ephraim's variation is supported by Greek MSS., and he has therefore had a text which used a different Greek text from P.

Acts 5:41, E ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ, P ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܪܝܡ; E ܡܪܝܡ, P ܡܪܝܡ. "The first variant agrees with the Greek ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ συνεδρίου, the second is supported by Origen, the Æthiopic, and a few very late Greek cursives." (WOODS.)

2 Cor. 5:21, E ܐܠܗܐ, P ܐܠܗܐ; A ܐܠܗܐ, but also = P, Greek ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.

Gal. 5:22, E the singular καρπός = Greek, P καρποί.

The variants are few and not as significant as those of Aphraates. Nevertheless, the influence of another version than the Peshitta cannot be denied. But that influence is not half so strong as in Aphraates. The Peshitta text, as in the gospels, so also for Acts and epistles, is gradually gaining the upper hand, and it cannot have taken long before it stood, if not alone, yet *supreme* in the field.

It will be well to compare at this point the extent of the different canons :

The Extent of the Canon of the Doctrina Addai.

1. The Diatessaron.
2. The Acts of the Apostles
3. The epistles of Paul, probably without the epistle to the Hebrews.
There is no trace of 1, 2, 3 John, 1 and 2 Peter, James, Jude, and Revelation.

The Extent of Aphraates' Canon.

1. The four gospels in the Diatessaron and the separate gospels.
2. The Acts of the Apostles.
3. The epistles of Paul, including the epistle to the Hebrews.
There is no trace of 1, 2, 3 John, 1 and 2 Peter, James, Jude, and Revelation.

The Extent of the Canon of the Peshitta.

1. The four gospels.
2. The Acts of the Apostles.
3. The epistles of Paul, including the epistle to the Hebrews.
4. The catholic epistles, 1 Peter, 1 John, James.
The Peshitta omits 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and Revelation.

The Extent of Ephraim's Canon.

1-4 is like the Peshitta, but he cites also from 2 and 3 John, 2 Peter, Jude, and Revelation.

III. CANONICITY.

Now it will be asked : Did Aphraates regard these New Testament books really as canonical, or does he simply refer to them ? Had he really a *fixed New Testament canon* ?

There can be no doubt about this. In fact, we do not expect anything else, if we remember that he lived in the fourth century. But that might, perhaps, not be decisive in the Syrian church, which at Aphraates' time had scarcely existed two centuries. Aphraates, however, uses the entire Bible, the Old and the New Testament, as the court of final appeal. There is no difference for him in authority ; he has no grades of inspiration or canonicity. The New Testament stands on the same level as the Old Testament. He uses the same formulas of introduction in citations from the Old Testament and the New Testament. Mostly, of course, he uses for the Old Testament the form : "The prophet says," "David says," "He speaks in the prophet," "The living mouth speaks in the prophet," "It is written," "The Scripture testifies," "He says in

the Scripture." He introduces eighty-six quotations from the Old Testament, with, "It is written." For the gospels his introductory phrases are mostly, "Our Lord says," but also "*The Scripture says*" (BERT, p. 145), "The Lord *writes* (p. 60), "The King has *written* us thus" (p. 215), "He has *written* us beforehand" (p. 346), "Jesus, who is called your teacher, has *written* you" (p. 329), "*It is written* for you in the Word" (p. 330). There are fifteen citations from the gospels which he introduces with, "*It is written.*" Statements like these leave no doubt that the book is referred to; that not only the words of Jesus are canonical, but the gospels containing those words.

From the Acts of the Apostles he quotes only four times, introducing the citations with, "Our Redeemer says," also "The blessed apostles proclaim," "The Acts of the twelve apostles tell us about this," "The preaching of the twelve apostles testifies to us;" which shows that the book itself is referred to.

The epistles of Paul are, almost all of them, introduced by, "The apostle says." Never mentioning Paul's name in an introductory phrase, he regards Paul as *the* apostle *κατ' ἐξοχην*. Once only a letter as such is referred to by name: "The blessed apostle writes in the first epistle to the Corinthians and says" (p. 10). But he has also four quotations introduced with the formula, "It is written": 1 Tim. 1:9 (p. 21); 1 Cor. 6:5, "Again in another letter it is written;" 2 Cor. 6:16 (p. 274); Gal. 6:6 (p. 368). Two quotations are not counted here which may be just as well from the Old Testament as from Rom. 4:3.

Aphraates had, then, a fixed New Testament canon, which stood on the same level of authority as the Old Testament. And in this New Testament canon he distinguishes no degrees of authority; all the books are on the same plane.

The question which now faces us is: What is *the principle on which Aphraates bases his canonicity*? It is not necessary to inquire what is the principle of the Doctrina Addai and Ephraim, because Aphraates is a true representative of the whole Syrian church, which they are not. He is no acute theologian, who can draw hairsplitting distinctions; he is a thoroughly practical man, with a good deal of common-sense. His principle of canonicity will, therefore, be the principle of the whole church. Of course, we have to remember that he received his canon from the church, and would therefore accept it because it was generally accepted in the church. But his principle was therefore not the traditional. There is no hint of such a principle in his writings.

Why does he regard *the gospels* as canonical? Because they contain the words of our Savior. This appears over and over again. Nearly all of his quotations are, as already remarked, introduced by, "The Lord" or "Our Savior says." He does not think at all of an apostolic basis. The writers of the gospels are for him a matter of indifference; not even once is a single name of the evangelists mentioned. Parisot says he mentions John, but everyone who notices the quotations will see that this is not John the evangelist, but John the Baptist.

Why does he regard the epistles of Paul as canonical? Because they contain the words of the inspired apostle. Here also, his citations are almost always prefaced with, "The blessed apostle says."

Why does he regard the book of Acts as canonical? Because it is the mouthpiece of the twelve apostles; they speak in that book.

The principle of the canonization of the gospels is: Christ speaks in them; of the epistles: the inspired apostle Paul speaks in them; and of the Acts: the twelve apostles speak in them.

Now at last are we ready to turn to a reconstruction of the history of the New Testament canon in the Syrian church.

RECONSTRUCTION OF THE HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON IN THE SYRIAN CHURCH.

The earliest phases in the history of the New Testament canon in Syria are still veiled in darkness. However, the discovery of the Sinaiticus makes it plain that there was a great deal of activity displayed in the early Syrian church in regard to the text of the New Testament, or, better, of the gospels. It is probable that the two texts, Ss and Sc, are only specimens or representatives of other texts. The relative independence of these two texts leads one to think that there must have been made many translations of the gospels, which were more or less independent of each other. As more churches were built in the different towns and villages, the desire, the necessity, was felt to have a copy of the gospels, at first not for private use, but for the common worship in the church. They could not use the Greek originals; they needed a Syriac translation. How many texts there were we shall probably never know. I do not think that there is one type of the Old Syriac text; there must have been many. The task, therefore, will be to determine which of them is the oldest text. But we must not think that that oldest text was in general use in the entire church. Other texts slightly younger were probably used by others as the church

grew. They were, then, not copies from the Old Syriac, but different translations. But all this must, in the nature of the case, be a matter of conjecture. It is founded only on the relative independence of the two texts represented by Ss and Sc, and also of P. Again, we can say with no great amount of certainty, but with a good deal of plausibility, that at first not all the four gospels had been translated, but probably only one, then two, then three, then four. They were current in this single form. This is indicated by the different order in which the gospels stand in Ss and Sc. It is also very likely, as Professor J. Rendel Harris has shown, that an account of the passion was in existence in harmonistic form. This would be very natural, considering how great an emphasis the early Christians laid on the death of Jesus Christ, almost to the exclusion of the life which he lived in Palestine.

But we are on the ground of mere conjecture, however plausible and natural it be, until we come to the Sinaiticus. That is, as we have seen, the oldest form of the gospels of the Syrian church which we have in our possession. The Greek text which underlies it belongs evidently to the first half of the second century; of it the remark of Credner about Codex Bezaë, to which, as we have seen, this text is closely related, holds good:

Veränderungen wie diese konnten in der katholischen Kirche nur bis um die Mitte des zweiten Jahrhunderts mit dem Text der Evangelien vorgenommen werden, denn nach dieser Zeit hat die Behauptung eines göttlichen Ursprungs der neutestamentlichen Schriften in derselben allgemeine Anerkennung gefunden. Dieses Dogma lässt keine solche Behandlungsweise des Textes mehr zu, wie dieselbe mit dem Texte unserer Handschrift vorgenommen ist. Dann würde unserer Handschrift ein Text aus dem zweiten Jahrhundert zu Grunde liegen.

The same holds also good of Sc; but we shall speak of that later.

The translator of Ss was faithful to his original; but his aim was to give a good, forcible, and popular translation; he did not want to sacrifice the good Syriac to a very literal translation of the Greek. There are, then, in his translation certain minor points where he translates freely, just as we should expect from him. For him the substance was the main thing, and deep reverence for the letter is not one of his characteristics, which does by no means reflect on the faithfulness of his translation, but is nevertheless a sign that the books as such were not yet regarded as canonical.

Now, a few years later, about 172-5 A. D., Tatian made his Diatessaron, and it took at once possession of the field. It can easily

be understood that it should be used more than the separate gospels. It was much more convenient for the common people, and also for the reading in the church services, than the separate gospels. Moreover, it will be remembered that Christianity was at first only the religion of a minority; but with Abgar III., 176-213 A. D., it became the national religion. This great change coincided, then, with the origin of the Diatessaron. And it is due to this fact, in addition to its convenience, that it became the gospel book of the Syrian church, and that the separate gospels had to give way. This was, however, possible only on two conditions: (1) that the four separate gospels were not yet established by long use, which is quite in harmony with the result of our investigation; it was made about 160-70 A. D., perhaps between 150-70 A. D.; (2) that there was not yet a conception of the canonicity of the books as such. If that idea had already been present, such a substitution would have been impossible.

There can, however, be no doubt that even after the introduction of the Diatessaron the four separate gospels were used alongside of the harmony, especially by the educated classes, though probably not in the church services. That the separate gospels had adherents is seen to the fact that after the introduction of the harmony the Curetonian gospels were translated. They are later than the Diatessaron, but they cannot be much younger; that the underlying Greek text shows. The origin of this text was due to the desire to have the separate gospels in a text which corresponded more closely with the Diatessaron. It can hardly be much later than 200 A. D. And then, about one hundred years later, there is another text current in the Syrian church, as we see from Aphraates. The separate gospels had enough adherents during all this time.

But still the main text was the Diatessaron. And now it may be laid down as a fact that at the end of the second century the Syrian church used *as a church* only the Diatessaron of Tatian, and this was, I have no doubt, already regarded as canonical about the year 200 A. D. And that for the following considerations:

It is natural to assume that the development of the idea of the canon in the Syrian church should follow on the whole the line which is followed in the Græco-Roman church. Now, there the first thing that was regarded as authoritative or canonical was the words of Jesus Christ, no matter whether they were handed down in oral or in written form. When the gospels had been written, *they* were not regarded as authoritative, but simply the words of Christ which they contained; not the books, but the words of Christ, were canonical.

As time passed on, and there was no longer an oral tradition on which the church could rely, it was quite natural that the written gospels should increase in dignity. Now not only the words, but also the deeds of Jesus Christ are regarded with interest, from which it was only one step to regard the whole contents, or the gospels themselves, as authoritative. Of course, the ground of the authority of the books lay ultimately in the fact that they contained the words of Christ. But there were quite a number of gospels; how to distinguish those which were more authoritative from the others was the great question. All reported the words of Christ, however they might differ in other respects. It took quite a long time till our four gospels were regarded as exclusively canonical. And what was the test applied? Why were they regarded as canonical and others not? Because they were written by apostles and apostolic men. Apostolicity became the principle of canonicity.

It is significant for the history of the canon of the New Testament in the Syrian church that they started at once with our four gospels; they had not to pass through that long process through which the Græco-Roman church had to go, and which ended by limiting the number of the gospels which should be used in the churches to our four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Thus the unknown translator of the Sinaiticus translated these four; Tatian compiled these four, and no others; Sc and P are translations of these only. No matter how often the gospels may have been translated into Syriac, no matter how many copies there may have been of single gospels in the Syrian church, there is absolutely no evidence that the Syrians have ever had in these early times apocryphal gospels. They did not need to separate other gospels from these four canonical gospels. That had been done already for them by the Græco-Roman church. They inherit at once the result of a long struggle.

This explains why the Syrian church has the much more primitive and natural principle of canonicity, and is at variance with the entire Græco-Roman church in this point. It regards these writings as authoritative because they contain the words and deeds of Jesus. It does not attach any importance whatever to the persons of the writers of the gospels. Aphraates, as late as 340 A. D., does not even once mention the name of one of them. The words and life of Jesus are their basis of authority; no matter who has written the reports of them. That they are a reliable source their universal acceptance by the Græco-Roman church had shown.

Bearing this in mind, we do not expect a long development. The gospel canon must soon become fixed. At about 200 A. D. they would say, "As it stands written in the gospel," meaning by "gospel" the book.

We see, then, that at the end of the second or at the beginning of the third century the Syrian church had a very peculiar canon, such as no other church, so far as we know, had, viz., a gospel harmony, the Diatessaron of Tatian. To the truth of this statement the *Doctrina Addai* witnesses when it says that after Addai had for some time successfully labored in Edessa, "a large multitude of people assembled day by day and came to the prayer of the service, and to the reading of the Old and New Testament, of the Diatessaron" (p. 34). This shows that the Diatessaron was their first gospel *canon*.

The next step in the development is indicated by the *Doctrina Addai*, when it says (p. 44): "But the law and the prophets and the gospel, which ye read every day before the people, and the epistles of Paul, which Simon Peter sent us from the city of Rome, and the Acts of the twelve apostles, which John, the son of Zebedee, sent us from Ephesus, these books read ye in the churches of Christ, and with these read not any others, as there is not any other in which the truth that ye hold is written, except these books which retain you in the faith to which ye have been called."

There is evidently a distinction made between the law and the prophets and the gospel on the one side, and the epistles of Paul and the Acts on the other side. The gospel and the Old Testament are read daily. But the epistles and Acts have come later, which is indicated here by the sentences, "which Simon Peter sent us from the city of Rome," "which John, the son of Zebedee, sent us from Ephesus." They are directed to read these books also in addition to the gospel and the Old Testament, which they are accustomed to read every day in the service. The Diatessaron is plainly put on the same plane with the law and the prophets. The epistles of Paul and the Acts, though also authoritative, are not yet on the same level.

This is the first notice which we have about the epistles of Paul and the Acts of the Apostles in the Syrian church.

When they were first translated we do not know. Zahn suggests, on the basis of a remark of Eusebius, that Tatian had translated them and given them to the church.³⁸ But if nothing else could be said

³⁸ EUSEBIUS, *Eccles. Hist.*, IV, 29: "But they say that he [Tatian] ventured to paraphrase certain words of the apostle [Paul] in order to improve their style."

against this suggestion, one passage would seem to be conclusive, viz., the rendering of Rom. 1 : 3, which we find in Aphraates, "The apostle [by which always Paul is meant] witnesses: 'Jesus Christ was *from Mary, from the seed of the house of David*, through the spirit of holiness.'" This passage, which makes that doctrine, which was so obnoxious to Tatian, so clear, and develops it more strongly than the Greek, seems hardly to have been written by Tatian. Tatian, who did not shrink from omitting the genealogies and every passage which pointed to Jesus' Davidic descent, would certainly in his μεταφράσαι of the epistles omit this reference, or, at least, would not make the doctrine much clearer than it is in the original Greek. I recognize, of course, that Zahn suggests that this passage is taken from the apocryphal letter of Paul to the Corinthians, on which Ephraim commented. But that cannot be proved. That Ephraim commented upon this third letter of Paul to the Corinthians is no reason to think that it was in his canon. There is no evidence that it ever formed a part of the canon of the Syrian church. Besides this, Zahn himself puts this suggestion under the head of "Problematisches." But the reference is plainly to Rom. 1 : 3.

However, even if Tatian did not translate the letters of Paul, it must certainly have been done not very long after the translation of the gospels. It may have been fifty years, perhaps more. Just when it took place we cannot tell. The Doctrina Addai, however, which describes, as is commonly believed, the condition of the church as it existed in the period from about 200-250 A. D., would favor our pre-supposition that it was done about 230-50 A. D. Now, the question is: Can we rely absolutely on the statements of that document? As regards the statement that the Old Testament and the gospel and the Acts and the epistles of Paul were read in the churches, there can be little doubt that this is correct. But can we rely on the statement that the epistles of Paul were sent by Peter from Rome? Of course, Peter had nothing to do with it. He is introduced in accordance with the design of the writer to push the beginning of Christianity in Edessa back to the time of Jesus and his apostles. But can we infer from that statement that the epistles of Paul were imported from Rome? I do not think that the question can be absolutely answered in the present state of our knowledge about the Syrian church. All that can be said is that it is highly probable, if we take into account the fact that the Syriac text is very closely related to the so-called "Western" text, agreeing with it in many points where all the other

texts differ. Moreover, the frequent intercourse between the two cities explains much.

Now, if that be so, that the epistles of Paul were brought into the Syrian church from Rome, then we must conclude that the epistle to the Hebrews, which all Syrians regard as Pauline, was not in that collection. For at that time it was not regarded as Pauline in Rome. This is confirmed by the fact that the text of the Peshitta shows, as is generally accepted, marks which indicate that it was made by a different translator. Then the epistle to the Hebrews must have come in later. When that took place we again do not know. But about eighty or a hundred years later we find Aphraates using it as Pauline. He quotes it in the same way as the other letters of Paul, and there is no trace that he knew that it was doubted elsewhere. The certainty with which he uses it as Pauline indicates that it must have been added to the Pauline collection not so very much later. Perhaps it came very soon afterward, perhaps twenty or more years later than the other letters. All this is based on the assumption that the epistles of Paul were brought from Rome to Edessa.

As soon as it can, however, be shown that the Syrian church received its Pauline collection, not from Rome, but from Alexandria, the argument falls to the ground, and we need not assume that the epistle to the Hebrews was ever wanting in the Syrian collection of Pauline letters. But that is not proved yet, though it must be said that Aphraates' use of it would favor this theory; the tradition in the *Doctrina Addai*, the close relation between the Syrian and the Western text, and the difference of the translators point the other way.

Did, then, the Syrian church in that time, 200-250 A. D., receive all the letters of Paul except Hebrews, and was none missing?

The homilies of Aphraates would seem to indicate that not all the epistles were in his canon. He omits to cite Philemon and 2 Thessalonians. Now, Philemon is so small and of such a character that we are not surprised that he does not quote it. But why does he not quote 2 Thessalonians? We have to remember that he does not quote so very many passages from the epistles altogether, and his method of quotation does not warrant us in making the assertion that it was not in his canon, in the face of the fact that it was universally accepted in the Græco-Roman church. We must, therefore, conclude that his failure to quote 2 Thessalonians was due to accident, and that the Syrian church received, indeed, all the Pauline letters at that time.

When these epistles of Paul had been introduced they would undergo recensions, or there originated different translations of the epistles. Both these are seen in Aphraates and Ephraim. Certain passages show that the text, especially of Aphraates, was a more popular and free translation, so that this would be an earlier stage of the Peshitta text. Other passages show that there was a different translation from that of the Peshitta, because they are translations of different Greek readings. But since the bulk of the texts is the same, and the passages of this latter kind become much rarer in Ephraim, there is good reason to believe that both the Aphraates text and the Ephraim text mark simply two stages in the development of the Peshitta text.

The *Doctrina Addai* speaks also about the Acts of the twelve apostles, which they are directed to read in the churches. *Whence* it came is not known; for nobody regards Addai's statement, that John sent it from Ephesus, as historic. *When* it came can only be guessed at. It seems to have come about the same time as Paul's epistles. *How* it came nobody can tell. But I point to the fact that it came quite as suddenly and quite as mysteriously into the canon of the Græco-Roman church.

To sum up, then, the development of the canon until 250 A. D. There were originally the four separate gospels in use about 160-75 A. D. These were supplanted by the more convenient translation of the Diatessaron when Christianity became the national religion. About 200 A. D. the gospel canon is fixed; it is the Diatessaron.

In the time 200-250 A. D. the epistles of Paul, except Hebrews, and the Acts of the Apostles came in. Soon afterward the epistle to the Hebrews was introduced and added to the Pauline collection. At 338 A. D. we have the canon of the church comprising the Diatessaron of Tatian, the epistles of Paul, including Hebrews, and the Acts of the Apostles. Now, the whole method of Aphraates' quotation points to the fact that this canon was already for some time in existence. We should say, therefore, with a good deal of plausibility, that the Syrian church had a *fixed* New Testament canon already about 300 A. D., if not earlier. Of the catholic epistles and the Revelation there is no trace.

Meanwhile there was another movement active in the church, dating back as far as the beginning of Christianity in Edessa, insignificant and small at first, but its victory was inevitable. It was stated above that when the Diatessaron took the place of the separate gospels there were

still a good number of adherents of the old version. They translated the Greek gospels again and again. On the church at large this had no influence at first; it used the Diatessaron. But the fact must be recognized that these men had on their side the unanimous consent of the Græco-Roman church; for nowhere else was a harmony used.

I do not mean to say that they knew this, and that they endeavored to substitute the four separate gospels for the Diatessaron. But it had naturally to lead to such a step.

The movement was well under way at the time of Aphraates. He quotes from the Diatessaron, but also very often, perhaps mostly, from the separate gospels. We can no more say, in his case, that the Diatessaron was his only gospel canon, because of his frequent quotations from the other gospels. The separate gospels were equally canonical for him, and, since he is a true representative of the church at large, also for the church. It could be only a question of time which form should ultimately prevail; for that they would retain two different forms in their canon would be impossible as time went on.

Ephraim still uses the Diatessaron, writing a commentary on it, but his quotations are mostly from the Peshitta. He seems to have used the Diatessaron more for his private use and for the arrangement of his lectures on the exposition of the gospels, though very probably it was also still used in the churches alongside of the four separate gospels. It was very natural that some would substitute the separate gospels in the form of the Peshitta about Ephraim's time; others would still use the Diatessaron. As always, so also here, there were two parties, the conservatives and the progressive liberals. Public opinion, however, strengthened by the unanimous action of the Græco-Roman church, must have been in favor of the Peshitta. This is expressed in the order of Rabbula, bishop of Edessa, 412-35 A. D., who says:

Let all the presbyters and deacons have a care that in all the churches there be provided and read a copy of the *distinct* gospels.

And soon the final step is seen in the destruction of the remaining copies of the Diatessaron by Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrus, 423-57 A. D., who tells about it as follows:

Tatian also composed the gospel which is called Diatessaron, cutting out the genealogies and whatever other passages show that the Lord was born of the seed of David according to the flesh. And not only did the members of his sect make use of this work, but even those that follow the apostolic doctrine, not perceiving the mischief of the composition, but using the book too

simply as an abridgment. And I myself found more than two hundred such books held in respect in the churches of our parts ; and I collected and put them all away and put the gospels of the four evangelists in their place.

With this we have reached the end of the development of the gospel canon in the Syrian church. The Peshitta held from now on the field ; it has never been supplanted.

While this struggle of the gospels was going on, there was simultaneously with it the development of the Acts of the Apostles and the epistles. When the epistles of Paul and the Acts of the Apostles had come into the Syrian church, they would soon be bound together with the gospels. Now, since there were two parties, the one would have in its volume the Diatessaron and the Acts and epistles of Paul, the other, the separate gospels and the Acts and epistles of Paul.

It is very probable that their texts were different, the one set based on this MS. authority, the other on that. That would account for the differences in the quotations of Aphraates and Ephraim. Now, we have seen that Aphraates' canon did not contain more than the gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and Paul's epistles, and we concluded that this was the church's canon, so that then the Peshitta was not yet complete. It must, however, be admitted that the fact that Aphraates did not quote from any of the other books contained in the Peshitta might be explained by saying that he relied for his citations on the official canon of the church, and did not want to cite as authoritative letters which were not familiar to all and not contained in the people's Bible ; so that this fact does not argue for the non-existence of these epistles in Syriac form at his time. It is very well possible that they existed already in Syriac translations, but were not yet canonized. But did we not say that Aphraates' principle of canonicity for the epistles was apostolicity : the inspired apostle speaks in them, therefore are they authoritative ? Why did he, then, not accept these epistles of James, Peter (the first epistle), and John (the first epistle) ? Now, while this is perfectly true, we must not deny the influence of the general opinion on any man. He would certainly have no objection on the ground of his principle to accept these books into his Bible. But it would, perhaps, take some time for him, as well as for the whole church, to do so. They were so accustomed to regard Paul as the apostle *par excellence*, so used to regard his word, besides Christ's, as alone authoritative, that such a change in this opinion could not be effected in a short time. We have seen that the principle of canonicity of the Syrian church voices itself in Aphraates. Paul's epistles were accepted because

they were apostolic. Now, should it sooner or later be said that also other books were written by other apostles, who were just as eminent as Paul, the church would be inclined to accept them. There would be no reason, based on her principle, why she should not, and the fact is that she did, though not at once. The express prohibition in the *Doctrina Addai*, which was written about Aphraates' time, throws some light on this problem. "With these [the Old Testament, the gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the epistles of Paul] read not any others, as there is not any other in which the truth that ye hold is written, except these books, which retain you in the faith to which ye have been called." This remark points evidently to a time when the attempt was made to introduce other books into the canon of the church. What these books were we do not know. But it seems a safe conclusion that they were these three catholic epistles, 1 Peter, 1 John, and James. These had been translated and should be put into the canon. But as is always the case, there were men who were opposed to this, and to one of these opponents we owe that prohibition in the *Doctrina Addai*.

The time referred to may be adequately fixed. The *Diatessaron* was at that time the authoritative version for church use. This was before the time of Aphraates; the epistles of Paul and the Acts were regarded as authoritative, which was also the case in Aphraates' time and earlier. Later than Aphraates it can hardly have been, because Ephraim already calls the *Peshitta* "our version," and quotes from these epistles. It cannot be much earlier than Aphraates, for in his writings there is no trace of the catholic epistles, and no word is said about any attempt to introduce them into the canon. It may be that in his time, or, at the latest, very few years later (345-50 A. D.), the epistles were introduced into the canon.

So much is certain: Ephraim knew them and quoted from them. But besides, Ephraim quotes also from 2 and 3 John, 2 Peter, Jude, and Revelation; he knew, therefore, *all* the books of our New Testament. In this he went farther than the Syrian church as a whole did. The *Peshitta*, which marks the final step of the church's canon, receives only James, 1 Peter, 1 John; the epistles of those three apostles could be classed with those of the great Paul; it admitted no others. It is important to recognize that Ephraim is here out of line with the church at large. This finds its explanation in the fact that he traveled much and came in contact with the canon of the Constantinople church. Besides, it is an open question whether he quoted these books from the

Greek or from already existing Syriac translations. At any rate, the church did not follow him.

Perhaps a word should be said about his commentary on the apocryphal correspondence of Paul and the Corinthians. In the first place it should be noticed that it is not yet proved that this commentary has been written by Ephraim. It may be an altogether later work. In the second place, even if Ephraim wrote this commentary, that does not prove that this apocryphal letter of Paul was in the canon of the Syrian church. There is no trace of it. And, then, Ephraim went, as we saw, farther than the church at large did. I am quite certain that it was not in the canon of the church.

But the Peshitta with James, 1 John, and 1 Peter was rapidly growing in the favor of the people. Ephraim differs very seldom from it; it is called by him "our version." After him it must have been used almost exclusively, and when the Diatessaron was removed, the Peshitta was supreme. From the first half of the fifth century it reigns alone. Subsequent attempts to supplant it have failed. It is *the* version of the Syrian church. With this the history of the New Testament canon is completed in the Syrian church. Its development has taken a long time and is absolutely unique in the history of the New Testament.

VITA.

I was born August 28, 1877, in Ratingen, near Düsseldorf on the Rhine, Germany. From 1883-87 I went to the public school; from 1887-88, to the high school at Burscheid. In 1888 I entered the *Quarta* of the Royal Gymnasium at Düsseldorf, and remained there until 1891, in which year I left for Marburg on the Lahn, and stayed in the Marburger Gymnasium until the autumn of 1893. Then I returned to Düsseldorf, and was graduated in the spring of 1895. About a week after my graduation I sailed for America, and in the fall of the same year entered Union Theological Seminary in New York, and at the same time Columbia University, to study theology and Semitic languages. In 1898 I was graduated from Union Theological Seminary and received the degree of B.D. *summa cum laude*. From 1898-99 I was tutor in Union Theological Seminary. During my theological course I studied also Semitic languages with Professor Gottheil, of Columbia University, and with Professors Francis Brown and Briggs in the Union Theological Seminary. In the spring of 1899 the Faculty of the Union Theological Seminary appointed me a Fellow of the Seminary.

